

1989
NCAA

CONVENTION PROCEEDINGS

83rd Annual Convention □ January 8-12, 1989 □ San Francisco, California

National Collegiate Athletic Association

1989
NCAA

CONVENTION PROCEEDINGS

National Collegiate Athletic Association



THE NATIONAL COLLEGIATE ATHLETIC ASSOCIATION

Natl Avenue at 63rd Street
P.O. Box 1906
Mission, Kansas 66201
913/384-3220
May 1989

Edited By: Wallace I. Renfro, *Assistant Executive Director for Publishing.*

NCAA, NCAA seal, NCAA logo and NATIONAL COLLEGIATE ATHLETIC ASSOCIATION are registered marks of the Association and use in any manner is prohibited unless prior approval is obtained from the Association.

Table of Contents

I. Register 1989

Administrative Organization	7
Convention Delegates, Visitors and Working Media	24

II. Proceedings at the 83rd NCAA Convention

Opening Business Session	50
Opening Remarks	50
Convention Committees	52
Report of Council	52
Report of Memorial Resolutions Committee	54
State of the Association	56
Presidents Commission National Forum	64
Honors Luncheon	126
Division I-A Business Session	146
Opening Remarks	146
Proposed Amendments	146
Maximum Awards—Division I-A Football (No. 61)	146
Maximum Awards—Division I-A Football (No. 62)	149
Maximum Awards—Divisions I-A, I-AA Football (No. 63, Part A)	149
Recruiting Contacts—Division I-A Head Coach (No. 87)	150
Number of Contests—Division I-A (No. 126)	151
Review of Proposed Amendments	152
Division I-AA Business Session	158
Proposed Amendments	158
Maximum Awards—Divisions I-A, I-AA Football (No. 63, Part B)	158
Review of Proposed Amendments	158
Division I-AAA Business Session	166
Division II Business Session	168
Review of Proposed Amendments	168
Proposed Amendments	171
Initial Eligibility—Standardized Testing Deadline (No. 49, Part B)	171
Review of Proposed Amendments	171
Proposed Amendments	174
Maximum Awards—Division II Football (No. 66)	174
Maximum Awards—Division II Football (No. 67)	175
Review of Proposed Amendments	177
Proposed Amendments	180
Contact Period—Division II Football (No. 90)	180
Contact Period—Division II Basketball (No. 92)	181
Reconsideration of Contact Period—	
Division II Football (No. 90)	181
Evaluation Periods—Division II Football (No. 95)	182
Printed Recruiting Aids—Division II (No. 100)	182
Review of Proposed Amendments	183
Proposed Amendments	188

Playing Season—Division II Baseball (No. 134)	188
Review of Proposed Amendments	189
Waivers	190
Continuation of Division II Business Session	191
Review of Proposed Amendments	191
Reports of Committees	192
Division II Championships Committee	192
Nominating Committee	198
Other Business	198
Division III Business Session	200
Opening Remarks	200
Division III Forum	200
Reports of Committee	213
Division III Steering Committee	213
Executive Committee	214
Division III Championships Committee	217
Presidents Commission	220
Nominating Committee	222
Proposed Amendments	222
Financial Aid Package—Division III (No. 46)	222
Division III—Cost of Attendance (No. 68)	231
Postseason Football Contests—Division III (No. 188)	231
Transfer Eligibility—Division III (No. 115)	232
Financial Aid—Division III (No. 125)	232
Out-of-Season Practice Limitations (No. 135)	232
Continuation of Division III Business Session	237
Proposed Amendments	237
Foreign Tours (No. 136)	237
Individual Contest Limitations—	
Division III Basketball (No. 138)	237
Postseason Tournament Exemption—	
Division III Football (No. 139)	238
Contest Limitations—Division III Softball (No. 141)	240
Playing Season—Division III Track (No. 142)	241
Waivers	242
Division I Business Session	243
Opening Remarks	243
Reconsideration of Proposed Amendments	244
Reconsideration of Maximum Awards—	
Divisions I-A, I-AA Football (No. 63, Part A)	244
Reconsideration of Number of Contests (No. 126)	245
Proposed Amendments	246
Partial Qualifier (No. 42)	246
Eligibility—Partial Qualifier and Nonqualifier (No. 43)	249
Transfer—Junior College Nonqualifier (No. 44)	254
Initial Eligibility—Standardized Testing Deadline (No. 49, Part A)	255
Satisfactory Progress (No. 53)	256
Satisfactory Progress (No. 52)	260
Graduate Assistant Coaches (No. 64)	262
Maximum Awards—Division I Women's Volleyball (No. 84)	263
Contact and Evaluation Periods—	
Division I Men's Basketball (No. 88)	264
Contact and Evaluation Periods—	
Division I Women's Basketball (No. 89)	264

Printed Recruiting Aids (No. 99)	264
Official Visits (No. 101)	265
Seasons of Competition (No. 120)	265
Seasons of Competition (No. 121)	266
Playing Seasons—Division I Baseball (No. 131)	267
Preseason National Invitation Tournament (No. 133)	268
Resolution: Division I Men's Basketball Championship (No. 148)	269
Waivers	276
Nominating Committee	277
General Business Session	278
Acceptance of Reports	278
Proposed Amendments	278
Consent Package—Constitution	278
Partial Qualifier (No. 21)	278
Consent Package—Deregulation/Simplification	279
Reconsideration of Division Voting Action	279
Reconsideration of Partial Qualifier (No. 42)	279
Reconsideration of Playing Seasons—	
Division II Baseball (No. 134)	281
Proposed Amendments	282
Drug-Testing Consent Form (No. 6)	282
Playing Season—Football (No. 16)	282
Sports Sponsorship Criteria (No. 24)	283
Committee on Women's Athletics (No. 30)	283
Extra Benefits (No. 37)	283
Resolution: Cost Reduction (No. 39—1)	284
Pell Grants (No. 40)	287
Annual Legislative Calendar (No. 48)	290
Obvious Qualifier (No. 50)	292
Resolution: Initial-Eligibility Clearinghouse (No. 51)	294
Satisfactory Progress (No. 54)	294
Financial Aid Limitation (No. 56)	298
Summer School (No. 57)	298
Continuation of General Business Session	302
Proposed Amendments	302
Financial Aid—Nongraduates (No. 58)	302
Employment—Exhausted Eligibility (No. 59)	303
Resolution: Revision of NCAA Manual (No. 69)	304
Resolution: Interpretation of Revised NCAA Manual (No. 70)	305
Faculty Athletics Representative (No. 71)	305
Off-Season Drug Testing (No. 74)	308
Legislative Review Committee (No. 77)	309
Student-Athletes Advisory Committee (No. 77)	309
Baseball Rules and Division Baseball Committees (No. 78)	309
Ice Hockey Rules and Divisions I and III Ice Hockey Committees (No. 79)	310
Men's and Women's Soccer Rules Committee (No. 80)	310
Prospective Student-Athletes (No. 82)	311
Contact Restrictions (No. 83)	311
Summer Sports Camps and Summer Clinics (No. 85)	311
Tryouts—Development Clinics (No. 86)	312
Recruiting Contacts—National Letter of Intent	
Nonsubscribers (No. 94)	312

Football Evaluation Periods (No. 98)	313
Self-Financed Visits—Institutional Facilities (No. 102)	313
Official Visit—Transportation (No. 103)	314
Reconsideration of Football Evaluation Periods (No. 98)	314
Individual-Team Championships (No. 105)	314
Reconsideration of Football Evaluation Periods (No. 98)	319
Rescission of Football Evaluation Periods (No. 98)	319
Division III Football Championship (No. 106)	320
Team Championships (No. 107)	322
Student-Athletes Statement—Automobile and Loan Information (No. 109)	323
High School All-Star Games (No. 110)	323
Major Junior A Ice Hockey (No. 111)	324
Incidental Expenses—Olympic Festival Volleyball Tryouts (No. 112)	325
Summer Basketball (No. 113)	325
Transfer Rule—One-Time Exception (No. 116)	326
Reconsideration of Summer Basketball (No. 113)	327
Transfer Rule—One-Time Exception (No. 117)	328
Junior College Transfer Student—Dropped Sport (No. 118)	328
Reconsideration of Pell Grants (No. 40)	328
Reconsideration of Summer Baseball (No. 113)	329
Reconsideration of Incidental Expenses—Olympic Festival Volleyball Tryouts (No. 112)	329
Junior College Transfer Waiver—Limited Preseason Tryouts (No. 119)	330
“Restricted Membership”—Probationary Period (No. 122)	330
“Restricted Membership” Waiver (No. 123)	333
Football Coaches Retirement Trust Benefit Game (No. 129)	334
Postseason Tournament Exemption—Division III Football (No. 129)	335
Postseason Tournament Exemption—Division III Football (No. 140)	335
Recruiting Contacts (No. 143)	336
Promotional Activities (No. 144)	337
Recruiting Contacts—Banquets and Meetings (No. 145)	337
Travel to NCAA Championships and Special Events During Vacation Period (No. 146)	338
Preseason Practice—Football (No. 147)	338
Committee Reports	338
Nominating Committee	338
Men's and Women's Committees on Committees	338
Supplement to Memorial Resolutions Committee Report	338
Closing Remarks	339

III. Appendices

A. Legislative Proposals	A-1
B. Roll-Call Voting	A-131
C. Convention Committees	A-145
D. NCAA Convention Sites	A-147
E. Past and Present NCAA Officers	A-149

Administrative Organization

NCAA Administrative Committee

The Administrative Committee includes the NCAA officers (president, secretary-treasurer, division vice-presidents) and the NCAA executive director.

President

WILFORD S. BAILEY

Professor

Auburn University

Auburn University, Alabama 36849-3501

(Term Expires January 1989*)

Secretary-Treasurer

THOMAS J. FRERICKS

Vice-President

and Director of Athletics

University of Dayton

Dayton, Ohio 45469

(Term Expires January 1989*)

Executive Director

RICHARD D. SCHULTZ

Nall Avenue at 63rd Street

P.O. Box 1906

Mission, Kansas 66201

Division I Vice-President: Albert M. Witte, University of Arkansas, Fayetteville
(Term Expires January 1989*)

Division II Vice-President: Howard Elwell, Gannon University (Term
Expires January 1989*)

Division III Vice-President: Alvin J. Van Wie, College of Wooster (Term
Expires January 1990*)

NCAA Council

The Council is elected by the annual Convention of the Association. The NCAA president and secretary-treasurer are ex officio members and serve as chair and secretary, respectively. The other 44 members of the Council shall include 22 members from Division I (including at least two chief executive officers and at least six women), 11 members from Division II (including at least two chief executive officers and at least three women), and 11 members from Division III (including at least two chief executive officers and at least three women). The representatives of each division are elected for terms of four years by the membership of that division present and voting at the division business session during the annual Convention. [Constitution 5-1.]

*Not eligible for reelection to this position.

Division I

<i>Name, Institution</i>	<i>Representing</i>	<i>Term Expires</i>
Thurston E. Banks Associate Professor of Chemistry Tennessee Technological University Cookeville, Tennessee 38505	I-AA Central (Region 2)	Jan. 1989
Victor A. Bubas Commissioner Sun Belt Conference 1408 North Westshore Boulevard Tampa, Florida 33607	I-AAA (Region 2)	Jan. 1990*
Susan A. Collins Assistant Director of Athletics George Mason University Fairfax, Virginia 22030	I-AAA (Region 1)	Jan. 1992*
Joan C. Cronan Director of Women's Athletics University of Tennessee Knoxville, Tennessee 37996-3110	I-A Southeastern Conference (Region 2)	Jan. 1991*
Joseph N. Crowley President University of Nevada Reno, Nevada 89557	I-AA West (Region 4)	Jan. 1992*
Della Durant Assistant Director of Athletics Pennsylvania State University University Park, Pennsylvania 16802	I-At Large (Region 1)	Jan. 1991*
Frederick E. Gruninger Director of Athletics Rutgers University New Brunswick, New Jersey 08903	I-A Independent North (Region 1)	Jan. 1992*
Frederick Hemke Professor of Music Northwestern University Evanston, Illinois 60201	I-A Big Ten Conference (Region 3)	Jan. 1989*
Douglas S. Hobbs Professor of Political Science University of California Los Angeles, California 90024	I-A Pacific 10 Conference (Region 4)	Jan. 1992*
Cecil W. Ingram Director of Athletics Florida State University Tallahassee, Florida 32306	I-A Independent South (Region 2)	Jan. 1990*

*Not eligible for reelection to this position.

<i>Name, Institution</i>	<i>Representing</i>	<i>Term Expires</i>
Clayne R. Jensen Dean, College of Physical Education Brigham Young University Provo, Utah 84602	I-A Western Athletic Conference (Region 4)	Jan. 1990*
James W. Lessig Commissioner Mid-American Athletic Conference Four SeaGate, Suite 501 Toledo, Ohio 43604	I-A Mid-American Athletic Conference (Region 3)	Jan. 1989
Kathleen M. McNally Assistant Director of Athletics La Salle University Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19141	I-AAA (Region 1)	Jan. 1990*
John P. Reardon Jr. Director of Athletics Harvard University Cambridge, Massachusetts 02138	I-AA East (Region 1)	Jan. 1990*
James W. Shaffer Commissioner Midwestern Collegiate Conference 201 South Capitol Avenue, Suite 500 Indianapolis, Indiana 46225	I-AAA (Region 3)	Jan. 1992*
B. J. Skelton Dean, Admissions and Registration Clemson University Clemson, South Carolina 29634-4019	I-A Atlantic Coast Conference (Region 2)	Jan. 1992*
Robert R. Snell Professor, Civil Engineering Department Kansas State University Manhattan, Kansas 66506	I-A Big Eight Conference (Region 3)	Jan. 1990*
John E. Thomas Chancellor Appalachian State University Boone, North Carolina 28608	I-AA South (Region 2)	Jan. 1989*
Charlotte West Associate Director of Athletics Southern Illinois University Carbondale, Illinois 62901	I-At Large (Region 3)	Jan. 1991*
Charles Whitcomb Professor of Recreation/ Leisure Studies San Jose State University San Jose, California 95192-0060	I-A Big West Conference (Region 4)	Jan. 1991*

*Not eligible for reelection to this position

<i>Name, Institution</i>	<i>Representing</i>	<i>Term Expires</i>
Albert M. Witte Professor of Law University of Arkansas Fayetteville, Arkansas 72701	I-A Southwest Athletic Conference (Region 4)	Jan. 1989*
Sarah E. J. Yates Associate Director of Athletics Florida A&M University Tallahassee, Florida 32307	I-At Large (Region 2)	Jan. 1989

Division II

<i>Name, Institution</i>	<i>Term Expires</i>
R. Bruce Allison Director of Athletics Colorado School of Mines Golden, Colorado 80401 (Region 4)	Jan. 1991*
Joan Board Coordinator of Women's Athletics Grand Valley State University Allendale, Michigan 49401 (Region 3)	Jan. 1989*
Raymond M. Burse President Kentucky State University Frankfort, Kentucky 40601 (Region 3)	Jan. 1989*
Howard Elwell Director of Athletics Gannon University Erie, Pennsylvania 16541 (Region 1)	Jan. 1989*
Jerry M. Hughes Director of Athletics Central Missouri State University Warrensburg, Missouri 64093 (Region 3)	Jan. 1992*
Karen L. Miller Director of Athletics California State Polytechnic University Pomona, California 91768 (Region 4)	Jan. 1992*
Ronald J. Petro Director of Athletics University of Alaska Anchorage, Alaska 99508 (Region 4)	Jan. 1991*

*Not eligible for reelection to this position

<i>Name, Institution</i>	<i>Term Expires</i>
Elwood N. Shields Director of Athletics Bentley College Waltham, Massachusetts 02254 (Region 1)	Jan. 1990*
Sandra T. Shuler Associate Director of Athletics North Carolina Central University Durham, North Carolina 27713 (Region 2)	Jan. 1990*
Marjorie A. Trout Director of Women's Athletics Millersville University of Pennsylvania Millersville, Pennsylvania 17551 (Region 1)	Jan. 1992*
Kent Wyatt President Delta State University Cleveland, Mississippi 38733 (Region 2)	Jan. 1991*

Division III

<i>Name, Institution</i>	<i>Term Expires</i>
Mary R. Barrett Associate Director of Athletics University of Massachusetts Boston, Massachusetts 02125 (Region 1)	Jan. 1990*
Rocco J. Carzo Director of Athletics Tufts University Medford, Massachusetts 02155 (Region 1)	Jan. 1992*
George M. Harmon President Millsaps College Jackson, Mississippi 39210 (Region 3)	Jan. 1989
Thomas M. Kinder Director of Athletics, Chair, Physical Education Department Bridgewater College Bridgewater, Virginia 22812 (Region 3)	Jan. 1989*

*Not eligible for reelection to this position

*Name, Institution**Term Expires*

William A. Marshall
Director of Athletics
Franklin and Marshall College
Lancaster, Pennsylvania 17604-3003
(Region 2)

Patricia A. Rogers
Department Chair, Physical Education
Associate Director of Athletics
State University of New York
Albany, New York 12222
(Region 2)

Lewis S. Salter
Chancellor
Wabash College
Crawfordsville, Indiana 47933
(Region 3)

John M. Schael
Director of Athletics
Washington University
St. Louis, Missouri 63130
(Region 4)

Jenepher P. Shillingford
Director of Athletics
Bryn Mawr College
Bryn Mawr, Pennsylvania 19010
(Region 2)

Judith M. Sweet
Director of Athletics
University of California, San Diego
La Jolla, California 92093
(Region 4)

Alvin J. Van Wie
Director of Athletics, Chair,
Physical Education Department
College of Wooster
Wooster, Ohio 44691
(Region 3)

Jan. 1990*

Jan. 1991*

Jan. 1989*

Jan. 1991*

Jan. 1989

Jan. 1989*

Jan. 1990*

*Not eligible for reelection to this position

NCAA Executive Committee

The NCAA president and secretary-treasurer are ex officio members of the Executive Committee. The division vice-presidents automatically are members, and the remaining nine members are elected by the Council for terms of five years. The terms of not more than two of the nine Council-elected members shall expire in any one year. [Constitution 5-2.]

<i>Division</i>	<i>Name, Institution</i>	<i>Term Expires</i>
I-AA	Francis W. Bonner Professor of English Furman University Greenville, South Carolina 29613	Jan. 1990*
I-A	Edward E. Bozik Assistant President, Director of Athletics University of Pittsburgh Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania 15213	Jan. 1990*
I-AA	Marino H. Casem Director of Athletics Southern University Baton Rouge, Louisiana 70813-2109	Jan. 1991*
I-A	Eugene F. Corrigan Commissioner Atlantic Coast Conference P.O. Box 29169 Greensboro, North Carolina 27429-9169	Jan. 1989
I-AAA	Don J. DiJulia Assistant Vice-President and Director of Athletics St. Joseph's University Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19131	Jan. 1990
II VP	Howard Elwell Director of Athletics Gannon University Erie, Pennsylvania 16541	Jan. 1989*
III	Royce N. Flippin Jr. Director of Athletics Massachusetts Institute of Technology Cambridge, Massachusetts 02139	Jan. 1991*
II	Rosemary Fri Associate Director of Athletics University of Northern Colorado Greeley, Colorado 80639	Jan. 1991*
I-A	Leanne Grotke Associate Director of Athletics California State University Fullerton, California 92634	Jan. 1990*

*Not eligible for reelection to this position.

<i>Division</i>	<i>Name, Institution</i>	<i>Term Expires</i>
I-A	Martha E. Hawthorne Assistant Director of Athletics Rice University Houston, Texas 77005	Jan. 1992*
III VP	Alvin J. Van Wie Director of Athletics, Chair, Physical Education Dept. College of Wooster Wooster, Ohio 44691	Jan. 1990*
I VP (I-A)	Albert M. Witte Professor of Law University of Arkansas Fayetteville, Arkansas 72701	Jan. 1989*

*Not eligible for reelection to this position.

Presidents Commission

The Presidents Commission is elected by a mail vote of the chief executive officers of all member institutions (or selected by the Division I-A conferences). The 44 members shall include 22 who shall represent Division I members, 11 who shall represent Division II members and 11 who shall represent Division III members. At least three women shall be included, preferably one from each division. The representatives of each division are elected for terms of four years by the chief executive officers of that division (or by the Division I-A conferences). The officers of the Presidents Commission are elected from among the members of the Commission by a majority vote of the Commission's members to serve for two years.

	<i>Term as Chair Expires</i>
Commission Chair: Martin A. Massengale University of Nebraska, Lincoln	Jan. 1990*
Division I Chair: Michael Schwartz Kent State University	Jan. 1989*
Division II Chair: Thomas A. Bond Clarion University of Pennsylvania	Jan. 1990*
Division III Chair: George Drake Grinnell College	Jan. 1989*

Division I

<i>Name, Institution</i>	<i>Representing</i>	<i>Term Expires</i>
Lattie F. Coor President University of Vermont Burlington, Vermont 05405	I-AAA (Region 1)	Jan. 1990*
Marshall M. Criser President University of Florida Gainesville, Florida 32611	I-A Southeastern Conference (Region 2)	Jan. 1992*
Edward B. Fort Chancellor North Carolina A&T State University Greensboro, North Carolina 27411	I-AA South (Region 2)	Jan. 1990*
Gail Fullerton President San Jose State University San Jose, California 95192	I-A At-Large (Region 4)	Jan. 1992*
Harold H. Haak President California State University Fresno, California 93740	I-A Big West Conference (Region 4)	Jan. 1991*

*Not eligible for reelection to this position

<i>Name, Institution</i>	<i>Representing</i>	<i>Term Expires</i>
Rev. Timothy S. Healy President Georgetown University Washington, D C 20057	I-AAA (Region 1)	Jan. 1992*
Thomas K. Hearn Jr. President Wake Forest University Winston-Salem, North Carolina 27109	I-A Atlantic Coast Conference (Region 2)	Jan. 1990
Edward H. Jennings President Ohio State University Columbus, Ohio 43210	I-A Big Ten Conference (Region 3)	Jan. 1992*
Peter Likins President Lehigh University Bethlehem, Pennsylvania 18015	I-AA East (Region 1)	Jan. 1989*
Martin A. Massengale Chancellor University of Nebraska Lincoln, Nebraska 68588	I-A Big Eight Conference (Region 3)	Jan. 1991*
Rev. J. Donald Monan President Boston College Chestnut Hill, Massachusetts 02167	I-A Independent North (Region 1)	Jan. 1989*
Gregory M. St. L. O'Brien Chancellor University of New Orleans New Orleans, Louisiana 70148	I-AAA (Region 2)	Jan. 1990
Chase N. Peterson President University of Utah Salt Lake City, Utah 84112	I-A Western Athletic Conference (Region 4)	Jan. 1989
Stanley G. Rives President Eastern Illinois University Charleston, Illinois 61920	I-AA Central (Region 3)	Jan. 1991*
Michael Schwartz President Kent State University Kent, Ohio 44242	I-A Mid-American Conference (Region 3)	Jan. 1989*
Bernard F. Sliger President Florida State University Tallahassee, Florida 32306	I-A Independent South (Region 2)	Jan. 1991*

*Not eligible for reelection to this position.

<i>Name, Institution</i>	<i>Representing</i>	<i>Term Expires</i>
Stephen Joel Trachtenberg President George Washington University Washington, D C. 20052	I-AAA (Region 1)	Jan. 1989
William E. Tucker Chancellor Texas Christian University Fort Worth, Texas 76129	I-A Southwest Athletic Conference (Region 4)	Jan. 1990*
Dwight D. Vines President Northeast Louisiana University Monroe, Louisiana 71209	I-AA West (Region 4)	Jan. 1992*
Walter Washington President Alcorn State University Lorman, Mississippi 39096	I-AA At-Large (Region 4)	Jan. 1989*
Frederick P. Whiddon President University of South Alabama Mobile, Alabama 36688	I-AAA At-Large (Region 2)	Jan. 1991*
Charles E. Young Chancellor University of California Los Angeles, California 90024	I-A Pacific-10 Conference (Region 4)	Jan. 1990

Division II

<i>Name, Institution</i>	<i>Term Expires</i>
Michael J. Adanti President Southern Connecticut State University New Haven, Connecticut 06515 (Region 1)	Jan. 1991*
James B. Appleberry President Northern Michigan University Marquette, Michigan 49859 (Region 3)	Jan. 1990*
Billy C. Black President Albany State College Albany, Georgia 31705 (Region 2)	Jan. 1991*

*Not eligible for reelection to this position.

<i>Name, Institution</i>	<i>Term Expires</i>
Thomas A. Bond President Clarion University of Pennsylvania Clarion, Pennsylvania 16214 (Region 1)	Jan. 1990*
Asa N. Green President Livingston University Livingston, Alabama 35470 (Region 2)	Jan. 1992*
William T. O'Hara President Bryant College Smithfield, Rhode Island 02917 (Region 1)	Jan. 1990*
Walter R. Peterson President Franklin Pierce College Rindge, New Hampshire 03461 (Region 1)	Jan. 1992*
Margaret R. Preska President Mankato State University Mankato, Minnesota 56001 (Region 3)	Jan. 1992*
Tyronza R. Richmond Chancellor North Carolina Central University Durham, North Carolina 27707 (Region 2)	Jan. 1989
Lloyd D. Vincent President Angelo State University San Angelo, Texas 76909 (Region 4)	Jan. 1991*
Del D. Weber Chancellor University of Nebraska Omaha, Nebraska 68182 (Region 4)	Jan. 1989*

*Not eligible for reelection to this position

<i>Name, Institution</i>	<i>Term Expires</i>
John R. Brazil President Southeastern Massachusetts University North Dartmouth, Massachusetts 02747 (Region 1)	Jan. 1991*
Rev. William J. Byron President Catholic University Washington, D.C. 20064 (Region 1)	Jan. 1990*
Edward Coll President Alfred University Alfred, New York 14802 (Region 2)	Jan. 1992*
Anthony J. Diekema President Calvin College Grand Rapids, Michigan 49506 (Region 3)	Jan. 1992*
George Drake President Grinnell College Grinnell, Iowa 50112 (Region 4)	Jan. 1989*
Nenah E. Fry President Sweet Briar College Sweet Briar, Virginia 24595 (Region 3)	Jan. 1990*
Charles E. Glassick President Gettysburg College Gettysburg, Pennsylvania 17325 (Region 2)	Jan. 1992*
William A. Kinnison President Wittenberg University Springfield, Ohio 45501 (Region 3)	Jan. 1989*
William A. McMillan President Rust College Holly Springs, Mississippi 38635 (Region 3)	Jan. 1991*

*Not eligible for reelection to this position

Name, Institution

Term Expires

Jack L. Stark
President
Claremont McKenna College
(Claremont McKenna-Harvey
Mudd-Scripps Colleges)
Claremont, California 91711
(Region 4)

Catherine Tisinger
President
North Adams State College
North Adams, Massachusetts 01247
(Region 1)

Jan. 1991*

Jan. 1989

*Not eligible for reelection to this position

NCAA National Office

Richard D. Schultz, *Executive Director*
Thomas W. Jernstedt, *Associate Executive Director*
Stephen R. Morgan, *Associate Executive Director*
Louis J. Spry, *Associate Executive Director*
Ted C. Tow, *Associate Executive Director*

Administration

Merrily Dean Baker, *Assistant Executive Director for Administration*
Stanley D. Johnson, *Director of Professional Development*
John E. Lamb, *Director of Aviation*
Frank D. Uryasz, *Director of Sports Sciences*
Ursula R. Walsh, *Director of Research and Data Processing*
Kelly G. Conway, *Programmer/Analyst*
Kathy L. Day, *Programmer/Analyst*
Randall W. Dick, *Assistant Director of Sports Sciences*
Alex B. Freeburne, *Programmer/Analyst*
Oswaldo Garcia, *Assistant Youth Programs Coordinator*
Todd A. Petr, *Assistant Director of Research*
Edward A. Thiebe, *Youth Programs Coordinator*
Fannie B. Vaughan, *Executive Assistant*
Shirley Whitacre, *Membership Coordinator*
Ronald G. Wright, *Copilot and Head of Maintenance*

Business

Frank E. Marshall, *Assistant Executive Director for Business Affairs*
Richard D. Hunter, *Director of Operations*
William C. Foreman, *Building Superintendent*
Suzanne E. Mason, *Personnel Manager*
Lydia L. Sanchez, *Assistant Convention Director*
Donna L. Wells, *Accountant*

Championships

Patricia E. Bork, *Assistant Executive Director for Championships*
Daniel B. DiEdwardo, *Director of Championships*
Dennis L. Poppe, *Director of Championships*
Lacy Lee Baker, *Associate Director of Championships*
Karl D. Benson, *Assistant Director of Championships*
Patrick L. Chester, *Assistant Director of Championships*
Nancy J. Latimore, *Assistant Director of Championships*
Donna J. Noonan, *Assistant Director of Championships*
Betsy G. Stephenson, *Executive Assistant*

Communications

David E. Cawood, *Assistant Executive Director for Communications*
James A. Marchiony, *Director of Communications*

John T. Waters, *Director of Licensing*
 Alfred B. White, *Director of Promotions*
 James M. Van Valkenburg, *Director of Statistics*
 Cynthia M. Van Matre, *Assistant Director of Communications*
 James F. Wright, *Assistant Director of Communications*
 Steve Boda Jr., *Associate Director of Statistics*
 Richard M. Campbell, *Assistant Statistics Coordinator*
 Gary K. Johnson, *Assistant Statistics Coordinator*
 Regina L. McNeal, *Production Coordinator*
 Ronald Schwartz, *Director, Television News Service*
 119 West 57th Street, Suite 1212, New York, N.Y. 10019

Compliance Services

John H. Leavens, *Assistant Executive Director for Compliance Services*
 Terri D. Riffe, *Assistant Director of Compliance Services*
 Curt L. Hamakawa, *Compliance Representative*
 John P. Hardt, *Compliance Representative*
 Gary F. Karner, *Compliance Representative*
 Michael S. McNeely, *Compliance Representative*
 Julie F. Padgett, *Compliance Representative*
 Brenda Weare, *Compliance Representative*

Enforcement

S. David Berst, *Assistant Executive Director for Enforcement*
 R. Daniel Beebe, *Director of Enforcement*
 Richard R. Hilliard, *Director of Enforcement*
 Janet M. Justus, *Director of Eligibility*
 Robert J. Minnix, *Director of Enforcement*
 Charles E. Smrt, *Director of Enforcement*
 Joseph W. Buffington, *Enforcement Representative*
 Daniel A. Calandro, *Enforcement Representative*
 Carrie A. Doyle, *Enforcement Representative*
 Richard A. Johanningmeier, *Enforcement Representative*
 Mark P. Jones, *Enforcement Representative*
 Adrienne R. Lotson, *Enforcement Representative*
 Edward B. Lupomech, *Enforcement Representative*
 Arthur J. McAfee III, *Enforcement Representative*
 Steven C. Rueckert, *Enforcement Representative*
 William S. Saum, *Enforcement Representative*
 Stephanie A. Sivak, *Enforcement Representative*
 Robert L. Stroup III, *Enforcement Representative*
 Dirk L. Taitt, *Enforcement Representative*
 Janet S. Thomson, *Enforcement Representative*

Legislative Services

William B. Hunt, *Assistant Executive Director for Legislative Services*
 Richard J. Evrard, *Director of Legislative Services*

Nancy L. Mitchell, *Director of Legislative Services*
 Maureen E. Devlin, *Legislative Assistant*
 Daniel T. Dutcher, *Legislative Assistant*
 John R. Gerdy, *Legislative Assistant*
 David A. Knopp, *Legislative Assistant*
 Stephen A. Mallonee, *Legislative Assistant*
 Louis A. Onofrio, *Legislative Assistant*
 Richard C. Perko, *Legislative Assistant*
 Carol A. Powell, *Legislative Assistant*

Publishing

Wallace I. Renfro, *Assistant Executive Director for Publishing*
 Michael V. Earle, *Director of Publishing*
 Thomas A. Wilson, *Editor-in-Chief, The NCAA News*
 Timothy J. Lilley, *Managing Editor, The NCAA News*
 Maxine R. Alejos, *Circulation Manager*
 Theodore A. Breidenthal, *Publications Editor*
 Jack L. Copeland, *Assistant Editor, The NCAA News*
 Marlynn R. Jones, *Advertising Manager*
 Cheryl A. McElroy, *Publications Editor*
 Michelle A. Pond, *Publications Editor*
 Victor M. Royal, *Publications Production Coordinator*

83rd Annual Convention Delegates and Visitors

Active Member Institutions

District 1

American International College: Robert E. Burke
 Amherst College: Peter J. Gooding
 Assumption College: Francis P. Gurley, Kevin L. Hickey
 Babson College: Francis Millerick
 Bates College: Robert W. Hatch
 Bentley College: George Hachey, Elwood N. Shields
 Boston College: Rev. Robert Braunreuther, Mary Miller Carson, William J. Flynn
 Boston University: Averill C. Haines, Gary Strickler
 Bowdoin College: Sidney J. Watson
 Brandeis University: Jeffrey Cohen
 Bridgeport, University of: Ann V. Fariss, Francis W. Poisson
 Bridgewater State College (Massachusetts): Cecelia DeMarco
 Brown University: John C. Parry, Joan W. Taylor
 Bryant College: Leon A. Drury, William T. O'Hara
 Castleton State College: James R. Thieser
 Central Connecticut State University: Ross Baiera, Judith A. Davidson, Henry S. Enck, Frank R. A. Resnick, John W. Shumaker, Andrea S. Wickerham
 Clark University (Massachusetts): Linda Moulton
 Colby College: Richard L. Whitmore Jr.
 Connecticut, University of: John L. Allen, Patricia H. Meiser-McKnett, Todd Turner
 Connecticut College: Charles Luce
 Dartmouth College: Carolyn Campbell, Edward Leland, Louise O'Neal
 Eastern Connecticut State University: Stephen Kenton, Sharlene Peter
 Fairfield University: Harold Menninger, William P. Schimpf
 Fitchburg State College: Elizabeth A. Kruczek
 Framingham State College: Lawrence P. Boyd
 Franklin Pierce College: John J. Cunningham, Walter R. Peterson
 Hartford, University of: C. Donald Cook
 Harvard University: Myron B. Fiering, Patricia H. Miller, John P. Reardon Jr.

Holy Cross College: Ronald S. Perry
 Keene State College: Mary V. Conway, Joanne A. Fortunato
 Lowell, University of: R. Wayne Edwards, Denise Legault
 Maine, University of, Orono: Thomas D. Aceto, Linwood Carville, Judith A. Hakola, Kevin M. White
 Maine Maritime Academy: William Mottola
 Massachusetts, University of, Amherst: David C. Bischoff, Daniel Ghormley, Aloysius N. Rufe Jr., Elaine Sortino, Harold J. Vander Zwaag
 Massachusetts, University of, Boston: Mary R. Barrett
 Massachusetts Institute of Technology: Jane Betts, Royce N. Flippin Jr.
 Merrimack College: John E. Deegan, Robert M. DeGregorio Jr., Joseph Lee
 Middlebury College: G. Thomas Lawson
 Mount Holyoke College: Mary Park Morison
 New England College: Janet R. Kittell
 New Hampshire, University of: Marisa A. Didio, David O'Connor, Michael O'Neil
 New Haven, University of: Deborah Chin, William M. Leete Jr.
 Nichols College: Thomas R. Cafaro, Karen J. Tropp
 North Adams State College: Catherine A. Tisinger, Joseph Zavattaro
 Northeastern University: Kristin L. Burns, Irwin M. Cohen, Richard Lapchick, Keith L. Lee, Jeanne Rowlands
 Norwich University: Joseph G. Sabol
 Plymouth State College: Stephen R. Bamford, John P. Clark
 Providence College: John M. Marinatto
 Regis College (Massachusetts): Judith Burling
 Rhode Island, University of: Tom Dougan, Albert H. Taubman, John F. Vanner
 Rhode Island College: William M. Baird
 Roger Williams College: Joel B. Dearing
 Sacred Heart University: Henry W. Krell
 St. Anselm College: Theodore S. Paulauskas
 St. Michael's College: Edward P. Markey
 Salem State College: John D. Galaris
 Salve Regina College: Bro. Michael Reynolds
 Simmons College: Sheila Brown
 Smith College: Linda C. Hackett, Lawrence A. Fink
 Southeastern Massachusetts University: John R. Brazil, Robert A. Dowd
 Southern Connecticut State University: Michael J. Adanti, Louise Albrecht, Raymond W. DeFrancesco, Lawrence E. Fitzgerald
 Southern Maine, University of: Richard A. Costello, Remo H. Riciputi
 Springfield College: Bridget Belgiovine, Edward S. Steitz
 Suffolk University: James E. Nelson
 Trinity College (Connecticut): Richard J. Hazelton
 Tufts University: Rocco J. Carzo

U.S. Coast Guard Academy: Capt. James A. Foels
 Vermont, University of: Lattie F. Coor, Narbeth R. Emmanuel,
 Richard A. Farnham, Sally Guerett, Denis E. Lambert
 Wellesley College: Virginia L. Evans
 Wentworth Institute of Technology: Lee Conrad
 Wesleyan University: John S. Biddiscombe, Donald M. Russell
 Western Connecticut State University: Edward Farrington
 Westfield State College: F. Paul Bogan
 Wheaton College (Massachusetts): Charles L. Crawford, Lynn Miller,
 Chad Yowell
 Williams College: Robert R. Peck
 Worcester Polytechnic Institute: Raymond R. Gilbert
 Worcester State College: Susan E. Chapman
 Yale University: Barbara N. Chesler, Harold E. Woodsum Jr.

District 2

Adelphi University: Robert E. Hartwell
 Albany, State University of New York: William M. Moore, Patricia A.
 Rogers
 Alfred University: Edward G. Coll Jr., Eugene Castrovillo
 Allegheny College: Norman A. Sundstrom
 American University: Joseph F. O'Donnell
 Bernard M. Baruch College: William Eng
 Binghamton, State University of New York: Stephen Erber, Jessie A.
 Godfrey
 Bloomsburg University of Pennsylvania: Mary Gardner, Burton
 Reese
 Brockport State University College: Shirley Carmichael
 Brooklyn College: Arnold Markoe, Len Roitman
 Bryn Mawr College: Jeneffer P. Shillingford
 Bucknell University: Rosalyn K. Ewan, Thomas Greaves, Rick
 Hartzell, Robert A. Latour
 Buffalo State College: Fred J. Hartrick, Thomas J. Quatroche
 Buffalo, State University of New York: Norman Baker, Edwin D.
 Muto, Nelson E. Townsend
 California University of Pennsylvania: Janice L. McConnell
 Canisius College: Daniel P. Starr
 Carnegie-Mellon University: William F. Elliott, Joan E. Maser
 Catholic University: Rev. William J. Byron, Jone Dowd, Mary Milne,
 Fred O'Connor
 Cheyney University of Pennsylvania: Andrew Hinson
 Clarion University of Pennsylvania: Robert Carlson, Frank Lignelli,
 Hal Wassink
 Clarkson University: William O'Flaherty
 Colgate University: Frederick H. Dunlap, Braden Houston, Janet
 Little
 Columbia University-Barnard College: Marjorie N. Tversky
 Cornell University: Brian Austin, Betsy East, Laing E. Kennedy
 Cortland State University College: Lee Roberts

Delaware, University of: John L. Burmeister, Mary Ann Hitchens,
 Edgar N. Johnson, Richard A. Wilson
 Delaware State College: William B. DeLauder, John C. Martin,
 Gladys D. W. Motley, Ulysses S. Washington Jr.
 Dickinson College: Leslie J. Poolman
 District of Columbia, University of: Emma J. Best, Lee McElroy,
 Clarence M. Stewart
 Dowling College: Richard Jamison
 Drew University: Maureen T. Horan-Pease, Richard E. Szlasa
 Drexel University: John Semanik, Mary F. Semanik
 Duquesne University: Eileen B. Livingston
 East Stroudsburg University of Pennsylvania: Louis M. Marciani,
 Carey J. Snyder
 Edinboro University of Pennsylvania: James K. McDonald
 Elizabethtown College: D. Kenneth Ober
 Elmira College: Leonard Simons
 Fairleigh Dickinson University, Madison: Hallie Cohen, William T.
 Klika
 Fairleigh Dickinson University, Teaneck: Dean M. Batt, Roy Dan-
 forth
 Fordham University: Eugene P. Doris, Francis X. McLaughlin
 Franklin and Marshall College: Linda E. Hopple, William A. Marshall
 Fredonia State University College: Elizabeth Darling, Everett J.
 Phillips
 Gannon University: Howard Elwell
 Geneseo State University College: Ronald P. Satryb, John L. Spring
 George Mason University: Susan A. Collins, Michael G. Emsley,
 Jack E. Kvancz
 George Washington University: Steve Bilsky, Edward A. Caress,
 Robert A. Chernak, Susie Jones, Stephen Joel Trachtenberg, Mary
 Jo Warner
 Georgetown University: Wayne Knoll, Francis X. Rienzo
 Gettysburg College: Charles E. Glassick, Robert T. Hulton
 Glassboro State College: Joy L. Heritage, E. Theodore Kershner
 Hamilton College: Thomas E. Murphy
 Hampton University: Lenora E. Armstrong, Ollie Bowman
 Hartwick College: Kenneth Kutler
 Haverford College: Penelope C. Hinckley, Gregory Kannerstein
 Herbert H. Lehman College: Raymond F. Salvestrini Jr.
 Hobart and William Smith Colleges: Marc Van Arsdale
 Hofstra University: J. Richard Block, James V. Garvey, Cindy
 Lewis, James M. Stuart
 Howard University: William P. Moultrie, Sondra Norrell-Thomas
 Hunter College: Charles Brown
 Indiana University of Pennsylvania: Frank Cignetti, David A.
 DeCoster, Vivian L. Fuller, Herman L. Sledzik
 Iona College: Michael T. Christy, Joe Foulke, Richard Mazzuto
 Ithaca College: Robert C. Deming, Kristen M. Ford, Bonnie J.
 Gordon, James J. Whalen

James Madison University: S. Dean Ehlers, Leotus Morrison,
William R. Nelson, Robert L. Scott
Jersey City State College: Lawrence R. Schiner
John Jay College of Criminal Justice: Susan Larkin
Juniata College: William F. Berrier
Kean College: McKinley Boston, Patricia Hannisch, Patrick J.
Ippolito
King's College: John J. Dorish
Kutztown University of Pennsylvania: Irv Hess, Carol Teske
La Salle University: Kathleen M. McNally, Robert Mullen, Annette
O'Connor
Lafayette College: David W. Ellis, Olav B. Kollevoll
Le Moyne College: Thomas J. Niland Jr.
Lehigh University: Karen Adams, Marsha Duncan, Peter Likins,
Joe Sterrett, John C. Whitehead
Lock Haven University of Pennsylvania: Howard S. Lucas, Sharon
E. Taylor
Long Island University-Brooklyn Center: Tom Thompson
Long Island University/C. W. Post Campus: Vincent Salamone
Loyola College (Maryland): Thomas M. Brennan
Manhattan College: Francis R. Bowers, Robert J. Byrnes
Manhattanville College: Thomas Weingartner
Mansfield University of Pennsylvania: Bernie Sabol
Marist College: Brian Colleary
Maryland, University of, Baltimore County: Susan Kitchen, James
C. Mohr, Gary Rupert
Maryland, University of, Eastern Shore: Kirkland J. Hall, Joel C.
Mack
Medgar Evers College: Roy Anderson
Mercyhurst College: John M. Leisering
Messiah College: Layton Shoemaker
Millersville University of Pennsylvania: Gene A. Carpenter, Gary W.
Reighard, Marjorie A. Trout
Molloy College: Denise Cohen
Monmouth College (New Jersey): Joseph A. Biedron, Joan Martin,
Marilyn A. Parker
Montclair State College: Gregory L. Lockard, Merry Ormsby
Morgan State University: Leonard Braxton, Raymond A. Downs
Moravian College: Rocco J. Calvo
Mount St. Mary's College: Lynne Phelan Robinson
Muhlenberg College: Ralph Kirchenheiter
Nazareth College (New York): William H. Carey
New Jersey Institute of Technology: Paul C. Hausser
New Rochelle, College of: Kathleen LeVache
New York, City College of: Paul Bobb
New York Institute of Technology: John F. Borum, Clyde Doughty Jr.
New York Maritime College, State University of: James Migli
New York University: Jack E. Peckett
Niagara University: Michael Jankowski

Oneonta State University College: James Baker
Oswego State University College: Charles Davis, Jo Ann Meadows,
Alice Struzinsky
Pace University: Chris Bledsoe, Edward C. Zanato
Pennsylvania, University of: D. Elton Cochran-Fikes, Nicholas D.
Constan Jr., Skip Jarocki, Paul R. Rubincam Jr., Carolyn J. Schlie
Pennsylvania State University: John J. Coyle, Della Durant, Steve
A. Garban, Ellen L. Perry, James I. Tarman
Pennsylvania State University-Behrend College: John N. Grode,
Herbert J. Lauffer, John M. Lilley
Philadelphia College of Textiles and Science: Len Nardone
Pittsburgh, University of: W. Dean Billick, John W. Blanton, John O.
Bolvin, Edward E. Bozik, Jennifer Craig, Walter P. Cummins,
Donna Sanft, Carol J. Sprague
Pittsburgh, University of, Johnstown: C. Edward Sherlock
Plattsburg State University College: Peter Luguri, Eldridge W. Roark
Jr.
Polytechnic University (New York): Joseph G. Martini
Potsdam State University College: Charles Hunter
Princeton University: Amy Campbell, Robert J. Myslik, Thomas H.
Wright
Queens College: Brian DeMasters
Ramapo College: Kenneth McBryde
Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute: Robert F. Ducatte
Rider College: Viola Udy
Robert Morris College: Susan Hofacre, Robert D. McBee, C. Robert
Miller, Robert W. Norberg, Charles L. Sewall
Rochester, University of: James R. Ison, Jim Scannell, Jeffrey
Vennell, Joyce S. Wong
Rochester Institute of Technology: Charles A. Layne, Louis W.
Spiotti
Rutgers University, New Brunswick: Frederick E. Gruninger, Mal-
colm G. McLaren, Nancy Mitchell, Paul R. Vitek, Joseph P.
Whiteside
Rutgers University, Newark: John K. Adams, Florence A. Labenski,
James H. Ramsey
St. Bonaventure University: Lawrence J. Weise
St. Francis College (New York): Carlo Tramontozzi
St. Francis College (Pennsylvania): Roger A. Fessler
St. John's University (New York): Richard J. Krempecki, Kathleen
Meehan
St. Joseph's University (Pennsylvania): Don J. DiJulia, Paul High-
tower
St. Lawrence University: Robert J. Sheldon
St. Peter's College: Very Rev. L. Edward Glynn, William A. Stein
Salisbury State College: Dean Burroughs, William E. Lide
Scranton, University of: Gary N. Wodder
Seton Hall University: Sue Dilley, Laurence C. Keating Jr., John J.
Mitchell Jr.

Shippensburg University of Pennsylvania: Anthony F. Ceddia, Jane Goss, James G. Pribula
 Siena College: William J. Kirsch
 Skidmore College: Tim Brown
 Slippery Rock University of Pennsylvania: Robertha Abney, Robert N. Aebersold, William C. Lennox
 Southampton Campus of Long Island University: Mary E. Topping
 Staten Island, College of: Joseph Barresi
 Stockton State College: Robert M. Dixon, George L. James
 Stony Brook, State University of New York: Paul J. Dudzick, Sandra Weeden
 Susquehanna University: Donald Harnum
 Swarthmore College: Eleanor K. Hess, Robert E. Williams
 Syracuse University: David H. Bennett, John J. Crouthamel, Louis G. Marcoccia, Doris R. Soladay
 Temple University: Eve Atkinson, Joseph W. Marshall, Charles Theokas
 Thiel College: John A. Dickason
 Towson State University: James E. Ewig, Bill Hunter, Nance Reed
 Trenton State College: Kevin A. McHugh
 U.S. Merchant Marine Academy: Richardo Brown
 U.S. Military Academy: Brig. Gen. Roy K. Flint, Capt. Sally Jo Hall, Lt. Gen. Dave R. Palmer, Carl F. Ullrich, Col. Al Vanderbush
 U.S. Naval Academy: Jack Lengyel
 Union College: Richard S. Sakala
 Ursinus College: Adele P. Boyd, Robert R. Davidson
 Vassar College: Richard G. Becker
 Villanova University: Ted Aceto, Rev. Edmund J. Dobbin, Mary Anne Dowling
 Wagner College: Walter C. Hameline
 West Chester University of Pennsylvania: Susan W. Lubking
 West Virginia University: Kittie J. Blakemore, Forest J. Bowman, Fred A. Schaus
 Widener University: Bruce Bryde
 William Paterson College: Arthur Eason, Sabrina Grant

District 3

Alabama, University of, at Birmingham: John D. Jones, Claude A. McCann, J. Dudley Pewitt, Barbara Walker
 Alabama, University of, Huntsville: Clyde Riley, Julie Woltjen
 Alabama, University of, Tuscaloosa: Jim Goostree, Thomas L. Jones, E. Roger Sayers, Steve Sloan, Gary White
 Alabama A&M University: Charlie L. Rucker, Hoyt Taylor
 Alabama State University: Johnny Hardwick, Houston Markham Jr.
 Albany State College (Georgia): Billy C. Black, Wilburn A. Campbell Jr.
 Appalachian State University: Judy Clarke, Jim Garner, Alan J. Hauser, Bob Thomas, John E. Thomas

Armstrong State College: John G. Brewer, Robert A. Burnett
 Auburn University: Wilford S. Bailey, Joseph S. Boland III, James E. Martin, Kermit Perry, Hindman Wall
 Augusta College: Marvin Vanover
 Austin Peay State University: Oscar C. Page, Tim L. Weiser
 Averett College: Vesa K. Hiltunen
 Baptist College: Stephen D. Hudson
 Barry University: B. Boyd Benjamin
 Bellarmine College: David P. O'Toole, James R. Spalding
 Berea College: Joy Hager
 Bowie State University: Joseph A. Wilder
 Bridgewater College (Virginia): Mary Frances Heishman, Thomas M. Kinder
 Campbell University: Wendall L. Carr, L. T. Easley
 Central Florida, University of: William G. Callarman, Art W. Zeleznik
 Centre College: Charles Vahlkamp
 Christopher Newport College: Timothy E. Morgan
 Citadel, The: Walt Nadzak, Col. Gerald L. Runey
 Clark Atlanta University: Jean Chandler-Williams, Raymond Williams
 Clemson University: R. Allison Dalton, S. Leanord Gough, Nick Lomax, Dwight Rainey, Robert W. Robinson Jr., B. J. Skelton
 Coastal Carolina College of the University of South Carolina: Ronald G. Eaglin, Andy E. Hendrick, George F. Sasser
 Columbus College: Robert D. Peterson
 Davidson College: Christopher B. Morris, Caroline Price, J. B. Stroud
 Delta State University: Milton L. Bradley, Jim Jordan, Kent Wyatt
 Duke University: Tom Butters, E. J. McDonald
 East Carolina University: Richard R. Eakin, Dave Hart Jr., Ernest W. Schwarz
 East Tennessee State University: Charles E. Clark, Janice C. Shelton
 Eastern Kentucky University: Donald G. Combs, Martha Mullins
 Eastern Mennonite College: John H. Denlinger
 Elizabeth City State University: William Porter Jr.
 Emory University: Gerald B. Lowrey, James V. McMahon, Sandy Tillman
 Fayetteville State University: John D. Marshall Jr., Hayden B. Renwick
 Ferrum College: Thomas N. Hickman, Coulbourn H. Tyler
 Fisk University: Harriet A. Hamilton
 Florida, University of: Marshall M. Criser, Mandell Glicksburg, Ann Marie Lawler, Keith Tribble
 Florida A&M University: Frederick S. Humphries, Walter Reed, Sarah E. J. Yates
 Florida Atlantic University: Jack G. Mehl
 Florida Institute of Technology: William K. Jurgens
 Florida International University: Arthur W. Herriott, Mary Alice

Manella, Richard A. Young
 Florida Southern College: Hal Smeltzly, Lois Webb
 Florida State University: Charles W. Ehrhardt, Bob Goin, Cecil W. Ingram, Leo Sandon, Bernard F. Sliger
 Fort Valley State College: Douglas T. Porter
 Frostburg State College: Loyal K. Park
 Furman University: George Bennett, Francis W. Bonner
 Gallaudet University: Don Hasseltine
 Georgia, University of: Vincent J. Dooley, Lee R. Hayley, Elizabeth Murphey, William M. Powell
 Georgia Institute of Technology: Bernadette McGlade, James E. Murphy III, Homer C. Rice
 Georgia Southern College: William H. Bolen, Nicholas L. Henry, David B. Wagner
 Georgia State University: G. Rankin Cooter, William S. Patrick
 Goucher College: William J. Kaiser
 Greensboro College: Milton E. Reece
 Hampden-Sydney College: Louis F. Miller
 Hollins College: Lynda J. Calkins
 Jacksonville State University: Jerry N. Cole, Harold J. McGee
 Jacksonville University: Donald O. Jacobs
 Johns Hopkins University: Robert H. Scott
 Johnson C. Smith University: Horace T. Small
 Kentucky, University of: Joseph T. Burch, Kathleen J. DeBoer, Robert G. Lawson, David P. Roselle
 Kentucky State University: Raymond M. Burse, William K. Head, Charles H. Lambert, Donald W. Lyons
 Kentucky Wesleyan College: J. Robert Cockrum
 Liberty University: Chuck Burch, Allan F. Worthington
 Livingston University: Asa N. Green, James P. Pate
 Longwood College: William F. Dorrill, Carolyn V. Hodges, Barbara B. Smith
 Louisiana State University: Joe Dean, Billy M. Seay
 Louisville, University of: Dennis Golden, Burt L. Monroe Jr., William C. Olsen, Donald C. Swain
 Lynchburg College: Jack M. Toms
 Marshall University: Dorothy E. Hicks, William Lee Moon Sr., Dale F. Nitzschke
 Mary Baldwin College: Mary Ann Kasselmann
 Mary Washington College: Edward H. Hegmann
 Maryland, University of, College Park: William E. Kirwan, Lewis Perkins, Betty F. Smith, Suzanne Tyler, Kevin Weiberg
 Marymount University: Laurie Priest
 Memphis State University: Thomas G. Carpenter, Lynn Parkes, Timothy L. Sumner, Nicholas L. White
 Mercer University: Dan R. Quisenberry
 Miami, University of (Florida): Paul Dee, Sam Jankovich, L. Douglas Johnson, Harry C. Mallios
 Middle Tennessee State University: John E. Stanford

Millsaps College: George M. Harmon
 Mississippi, University of: Warner Alford, Kittye Jones, R. Gerald Turner, Max W. Williams, Leslie Wyatt
 Mississippi College: John W. Legg, Lewis Nobles, John M. Williams
 Mississippi State University: David C. Boles, Walter B. Newsom, Larry O. Templeton, Donald W. Zacharias
 Morehead State University: Steve Hamilton
 Morris Brown College: Greg Thompson
 Murray State University: David W. Perrin, Michael D. Strickland
 New Orleans, University of: Ronald J. Maestri, Gregory M. St. L. O'Brien
 Nicholls State University: Phil Greco
 Norfolk State University: P. LaVerne Sweat
 North Alabama, University of: Robert M. Guillot, Bill Jones, Roy S. Stevens
 North Carolina, University of, Asheville: Edward G. Farrell
 North Carolina, University of, Chapel Hill: Richard A. Baddour, Paul Hardin, Richard G. Hiskey, Beth Miller, John D. Swofford
 North Carolina, University of, Charlotte: Judy Rose, Thomas C. Turner
 North Carolina, University of, Greensboro: James H. Allen, Nelson E. Bobb, Fred L. Drake, Harold Hall, David B. Knight, William E. Moran, Debbie Yow
 North Carolina, University of, Wilmington: William J. Brooks, Charles L. Cahill, David K. Miller, James C. Sabella
 North Carolina A&T State University: Edward B. Fort, Orby Moss Jr., James A. Williams Jr.
 North Carolina Central University: Les Brinson, Christopher T. Fisher, Tyranza R. Richmond, Sandra T. Shuler
 North Carolina State University: Lawrence M. Clark, Nora Lynn Finch, Frank Weedon
 North Carolina Wesleyan College: C. Michael Fox
 Northern Kentucky University: Thomas J. Kearns, Jane Meier
 Notre Dame, College of (Maryland): Betsy Alden
 Old Dominion University: Mikki Flowers, James Jarrett, Melvin H. Williams
 Paine College: Ronnie O. Spry
 Radford University: Val Mah, Chuck Taylor
 Randolph-Macon College: Theodore S. Keller, Helmut Werner
 Rhodes College: Charles J. Gordon
 Richmond, University of: Harold W. Babb, Charles S. Boone
 Roanoke College: Edgar L. Green
 Rollins College: Ed Borsoi, Gordon E. Howell
 Rust College: William A. McMillan
 St. Augustine's College: Wanzo F. Hendrix
 St. Leo College: Norman D. Kaye
 St. Mary's College of Maryland: John H. Harvey
 Samford University: Stephen C. Allgood
 Savannah State College: John H. Myles

Shaw University: Thomas E. Kee
 South, University of: Mary Susan L. Cushman, William L. Huyck
 South Alabama, University of: Joe Gottfried, Jeral Williams
 South Carolina, University of: Sterling R. Brown, King Dixon II,
 James B. Holderman, William F. Putnam, Harold A. White
 South Carolina State College: John T. Bowden Jr., Oscar P. Butler Jr.
 South Florida, University of: Paul S. Griffin, Stewart W. Schneller
 Southern Mississippi, University of: Ralph N. Floyd Jr., Clyde Bud
 Ginn, Aubrey K. Lucas, H. C. McLellan, Sidney E. Weatherford
 Stetson University: Robert Weickel Jr.
 Sweet Briar College: Nenah E. Fry, Bonnie Kestner
 Tampa, University of: G. Jeffrey Klepfer, Bruce A. Samson
 Tennessee, University of, Chattanooga: Frederick W. Obear, Paul J.
 Watson, Harold B. Wilkes
 Tennessee, University of, Knoxville: Joan C. Cronan, Douglas A.
 Dickey, Malcolm C. McInnis Jr., Philip A. Scheurer
 Tennessee, University of, Martin: Ernest W. Blythe Jr., Bettye Giles,
 Ramon A. Mears
 Tennessee State University: George W. Cox, William Thomas
 Tennessee Technological University: Thurston E. Banks, David L.
 Larimore
 Troy State University: Fred B. Davis, Robert E. Stewart
 Tulane University: Chester S. Gladchuk, Milton Fingerman, Tom
 Peters
 Tuskegee University: James A. Martin
 Valdosta State College: Hugh C. Bailey, Joe A. Gore
 Vanderbilt University: John Cropp, Charles A. Kiesler, Roy V.
 Kramer, Joe B. Wyatt
 Virginia, University of: W. James Copeland, D. Alan Williams
 Virginia Commonwealth University: Edmund F. Ackell, Geraldine
 Garner, Alfreeda Goff, Richard L. Sander
 Virginia Military Institute: Col. Thomas W. Davis, Eric Hyman
 Virginia Polytechnic Institute: David T. Braine, Stephen J. Horton,
 Sharon McCloskey, James D. McComas, James I. Robertson Jr.
 Virginia State University: Leon W. Bey, Paulette W. Johnson,
 Rudolph Powell
 Virginia Union University: James F. Battle
 Wake Forest University: Thomas K. Hearn Jr., Gene E. Hooks, John
 W. Sawyer, Edwin G. Wilson
 Washington and Lee University: William M. Hartog, William D.
 McHenry
 Washington College: Geoffrey M. Miller
 West Georgia College: Jimmy C. Stokes, Maurice K. Townsend, Tom
 Virgets
 Western Carolina University: Gurney Chambers, Betty J. Peele,
 Terry Wanless
 Western Kentucky University: Paul B. Cook, Jimmy Feix, Pam
 Herriford, Thomas C. Meredith
 Western Maryland College: J. Richard Carpenter Jr., Carol A. Fritz

William and Mary, College of: John Conlee, John H. Randolph,
 Mildred B. West
 Winthrop College: Robert H. Breakfield, Doug Echols
 Wofford College: Daniel B. Morrison Jr.

District 4

Akron, University of: James Dennison, Robert Fournier, David
 Jamison, Mary Ann Tripodi
 Albion College: Frank Joranko
 Ashland College: Fred M. Martinelli, Robert L. Wendling
 Augsburg College: Marilyn Florian
 Augustana College (Illinois): John R. Farwell, Bruce R. McCart
 Aurora University: Sam S. Bedrosian
 Baldwin-Wallace College: Louis A. Barone
 Ball State University: Don Purvis, John E. Reno, Andrea Seger
 Beloit College: Ed DeGeorge
 Bethel College (Minnesota): Dave Klostreich
 Bowling Green State University: Mary Ellen Cloninger, John C.
 Gregory, Marvin L. Kumler, Paul J. Olscamp
 Butler University: Richard E. Martin, Mary Ann Rohleder, William
 L. Sylvester
 Calvin College: Anthony J. Diekema, Ralph Honderd, Doris Zuidema
 Capital University: Armin P. Langholz, Larry Scheiderer, Bob
 Zurfluh
 Carleton College: Mylla Urban
 Carroll College: Merle Masonholder
 Carthage College: F. Gregory Campbell
 Case Western Reserve University: Nancy Gray, Patricia B. Kilpatrick,
 David M. Hutter
 Central Michigan University: Edward B. Grant, Edward B. Jaku-
 bauskas, David B. Keilitz, Fran Koenig, Douglas W. Nance
 Chicago, University of: Starkey Duncan, Mary Jean Mulvaney,
 Rosalie Resch, Greg Warzecka
 Chicago State University: Albert Avant
 Cincinnati, University of: Nancy R. Hamant, Thurman Owens,
 Gordon Skinner, Charles F. Taylor
 Cleveland State University: John A. Flower, Ronald G. Schultz
 Concordia College, Moorhead: Armin Pippo
 Dayton, University of: R. Elaine Dreidame, Thomas J. Frericks,
 Dennis Gerdeman
 Denison University: Theodore H. Barclay, F. Trevor Gamble, Cheryl
 A. Marra
 DePaul University: William D. Bradshaw, James Doyle
 DePauw University: Robert G. Bottoms, Ted Katula
 Detroit, University of: Brad Kinsman
 Earlham College: Porter G. Miller
 Eastern Illinois University: Ron Paap, Stanley G. Rives, Robert E.
 Saltmarsh, Joan K. Schmidt
 Eastern Michigan University: John R. Adams, Lucy Parker, Eugene

D. Smith, Roy Wilbanks
 Elmhurst College: Allen F. Ackerman
 Evansville, University of: James A. Byers, Linda Crick, J. Robert Knott
 Ferris State University: Thomas G. Cook, Mark Kosciuszko, Roy J. Piede
 Grand Valley State University: Joan Boand, Thomas E. Hendrix, George M. MacDonald, Ron Van Steeland
 Gustavus Adolphus College: James M. Malmquist
 Hamline University: Linda C. Delano
 Hillsdale College: Jack H. McAvoy
 Hope College: Anne E. Irwin, Raymond E. Smith
 Illinois, University of, Champaign: Joni Comstock, Mildred Barnes Griggs, Karol A. Kahrs, John Mackovic, John E. Nowak
 Illinois, University of, Chicago: Thomas Russo, Jim Schmidt
 Illinois Benedictine College: John T. Ostrowski
 Illinois State University: Linda Herman, Susan Kern, Donna Taylor, Ronald D. Wellman, D. Jo Workman
 Indiana University, Bloomington: Ralph N. Floyd, Isabella Hutchison, Elizabeth Kurpius, Sara N. McNabb, Marianne H. Mitchell, Haydn H. Murray
 Indiana University-Purdue University, Fort Wayne: Donald J. Schmidt
 Indianapolis, University of: Kenneth D. Borden, William A. Bright
 Iowa, University of: Duane Banks, Larry Bruner, Chalmers W. Elliott, Christine H. B. Grant, Paula Jantz, W. Fred Mims, M. Dianne Murphy, Bonnie Slatton
 John Carroll University: Anthony DeCarlo, James M. Lavin, Kathleen Manning
 Kalamazoo College: Robert L. Kent
 Kent State University: Paul V. Amodio, Thomas J. Barber, Judy Devine, Michael Schwartz
 Kenyon College: Sam Freas, Sandra L. Moore
 Knox College: Harlan Knosher
 Lake Superior State University: James Fallis, Charles W. Jones
 Lawrence University: Rich Agness
 Lewis University: Dennis F. Rio, Paul Ruddy
 Loyola University (Illinois): Carolyn V. O'Connell, Samuel P. Rame-nofsky, Charles T. Schwarz
 Macalester College: Sheila Brewer
 Marietta College: J. Phillip Roach
 Marquette University: William L. Cords, Carla H. Hay, Tat Shiely
 Miami University (Ohio): Harold W. Jasper, R. C. Johnson, Paul G. Pearson, Karen Womack
 Michigan, University of: Gwendolyn S. Cruzat, Douglas Kahn, Jeff Long, Phyllis M. Ocker, J. P. Weidenbach
 Michigan State University: Kathy Lindahl, Michael Kasavana, Douglas W. Weaver
 Michigan Technological University: Ted Kearly

Millikin University: Merle W. Chapman
 Minnesota, University of, Duluth: Greg Fox, Linda M. Larson, Bruce M. McLeod, Richard W. Ojakangas
 Minnesota, University of, Twin Cities: Rick Bay, Holger Christiansen, Elaine M. Donahue, Jo-Ida Hansen, Kathy Jones, Donna J. Olson, Robert A. Stein, Chris Voelz
 North Central College: Walter J. Johnson, Rich Wilders
 North Park College: Tony Quinn
 Northern Illinois University: Robert J. Brigham, Cary Groth, Clarence Hudson, Gerald K. O'Dell, Nancy M. Vedral
 Northern Michigan University: James B. Appleberry, Richard B. Comley, Harold Dorf, Barbara J. Patrick, R. Thomas Peters Jr., Jerrold L. Saundri
 Northwestern University: Margaret Akerstrom, Anne S. Barbour, Bruce A. Corrie, Frederick Hemke, Ken Kraft
 Notre Dame, University of: Rev. E. William Beauchamp, Brian Boulac, Melissa L. Conboy, Joe O'Brien, Richard A. Rosenthal
 Oakland University: Glenn A. Jackson, Paul E. Hartman
 Oberlin College: George Andrews, Patrice A. Milkovich
 Ohio Northern University: Herbert N. Strayer, Sheila K. Wallace
 Ohio State University: Phyllis J. Bailey, James L. Jones, Bill Myles, C. J. Slanicka
 Ohio University: Robert Kline, Harold N. McElhaney, Peggy J. Pruitt, Shirley Slater
 Ohio Wesleyan University: David L. Warren
 Olivet College: Susan M. Bujack
 Otterbein College: C. Brent DeVore
 Purdue University: Buford H. Byers, Martha O. Chiscon, George S. King Jr., Philip E. Nelson
 Saginaw Valley State University: Robert T. Becker, George W. Eastland Jr.
 St. Benedict, College of: Carol Howe-Veenstra, Lu Ann Reif
 St. Catherine, College of: L. J. Larson
 St. Joseph's College (Indiana): Frederick R. Berger
 St. Mary's College (Minnesota): Linda Anderson
 St. Olaf College: Robert D. Gelle
 St. Thomas, College of (Minnesota): Jo Ann Andregg, Frank Mach
 Southern Illinois University, Edwardsville: James R. Buck, Cindy Jones, John Meisel
 Southern Indiana, University of: Larry Arp, Donald Bennett, Charles J. Bertram
 Toledo, University of: Allen R. Bohl, Calvin J. Lawshe, Tim Selgo, John W. Stoepler, Marnie W. Swift
 Valparaiso University: William L. Steinbrecher
 Wabash College: Joseph O'Rourke, Lewis S. Salter
 Wayne State University (Michigan): Dorothy E. Dreyer, William H. Markus, Christ Petrouleas
 Western Illinois University: Gil Peterson, Helen Smiley, Ralph H. Wagoner

Western Michigan University: Kathy Beauregard, Chauncey J. Brinn, Leland Byrd, Leo C. Vander Beek
 Wheaton College (Illinois): Tony Ladd
 Wisconsin, University of, Eau Claire: Stephen J. Kurth, Marilyn Skrivseth
 Wisconsin, University of, Green Bay: Charles A. Ihrke, David L. Outcalt, Daniel J. Spielmann
 Wisconsin, University of, LaCrosse: Patrick A. Trokan
 Wisconsin, University of, Madison: Katherine Saunders-Nordeen, Ade L. Sponberg, Jane Voichick
 Wisconsin, University of, Milwaukee: Bud Haidet, Paul Haubrich
 Wisconsin, University of, Oshkosh: Lynn King
 Wisconsin, University of, Platteville: Debra L. Schulman
 Wisconsin, University of, River Falls: Dean Henderson, Judy Wilson
 Wisconsin, University of, Stevens Point: Cal Kuphall, Nancy Page, Virgil A. Thiesfeld
 Wisconsin, University of, Stout: Warren C. Bowlus, Orville Nelson, Rita Slinden
 Wisconsin, University of, Whitewater: William L. Myers
 Wittenberg University: Linda L. Arena, William A. Kinnison, Virginia H. Lucas, Robert E. Rosencrans
 Wooster, College of: Gordon Collins, Nan Nichols, Alvin J. Van Wie
 Wright State University: Michael J. Cusack, Charles J. Hartmann, Paige E. Mulhollan, Peggy L. Wynkoop
 Xavier University (Ohio): Rev. Albert DiUlio, Jeffrey H. Fogelson, Earl J. Kronenberger, E. Laurie Massa
 Youngstown State University: Neil D. Humphrey, Joseph F. Malmisur, Jack O'Connell, Pauline Saternow, Frank J. Tarantine, Harold Yiannaki

District 5

Augustana College (South Dakota): Sandra Jerstad
 Bradley University: Martin G. Abegg, Ron Ferguson, Ron Koperski
 Buena Vista College: Mark Peterson
 Central College (Iowa): Kenneth J. Weller
 Central Missouri State University: Philip W. Conn, Ed Elliott, Paul Engelmann, Jerry M. Hughes
 Colorado, University of: William H. Baughn, James Corbridge, Bill Marolt
 Cornell College: David Marker
 Creighton University: C. Timothy Dickel, Don Leahy
 Drake University: Curtis W. Blake, Bob MacKenzie, Lou Ann Simpson, Jack Wallace
 Fort Hays State University: Edward H. Hammond, Robert Van Poppel
 Grinnell College: Diane Fairchild, George A. Drake
 Indiana State University: Brian D. Faison, John C. Jessell, Richard G. Landini
 Iowa State University: Norman L. Boyles, Charles E. McCandless,

Dick Towers, Max Urick
 Kansas, University of: Del Brinkman, Robert E. Frederick
 Kansas State University: Steve Miller, Robert R. Snell
 Kearney State College: Dick Beechner
 Lincoln University (Missouri): Yvonne Hoard, Lucius Jones
 Loras College: Robert Bieri, Jan Leiser
 Luther College: David T. Nelson
 Mankato State University: Georgene Brock, Joe Farnham, Margaret R. Preska
 Maryville College (Missouri): David R. Pierce
 Missouri, University of, Columbia: Haskell M. Monroe Jr., Carl Settergren, Richard P. Tamburo
 Missouri, University of, Rolla: Billy A. Key, Rodney A. Schaefer
 Missouri, University of, St. Louis: Tom Schnell, Charles Smith
 Missouri Southern State College: Sallie Beard, Jim Frazier, Wayne A. Harrell
 Missouri Western State College: Ed B. Harris
 Morningside College: Erv Mondt
 Nebraska, University of, Lincoln: Don Bryant, Robert S. Devaney, Barbara A. Hibner, Martin A. Massengale, James O'Hanlon
 Nebraska, University of, Omaha: Connie J. Claussen, Larry R. Trussell, Del D. Weber
 North Dakota, University of: Dave Gunther, George W. Schubert
 North Dakota State University: Lynn Dorn, Robert Entzion, Allan G. Fischer
 Northeast Missouri State University: Walter H. Ryle, Cheryl Tucker
 Northern Colorado, University of: Rosemary Fri, Robert A. Oliver
 Northern Iowa, University of: Robert A. Bowlsby, John Jermier, Steve Schmit, Jack D. Wilkinson, Sandra C. Williamson
 Northwest Missouri State University: Virgil Albertini, Richard R. Flanagan
 Oklahoma, University of: Donnie Duncan, Daniel G. Gibbens, Ronald E. Watson
 Oklahoma State University: Ann A. Baer, Gerald M. Lage
 Oral Roberts University: Jack P. Wallace
 Pittsburg State University: William O. Samuels
 St. Cloud State University: David H. Ellens, Arthur Grachek, Morris Kurtz, Wayne Simpson, David Sprague
 St. Louis University: Albert E. Bender Sr., Jon McBride, Joe R. Yates
 South Dakota, University of: Jack F. Doyle, George R. Horner, Mary Mock
 South Dakota State University: Harry L. Forsyth, Mylo A. Hellickson
 Southeast Missouri State University: Joseph H. Low Jr., Marvin Rosengarten
 Southern Illinois University, Carbondale: John J. Cody, Jim Hart, Margaret Matthias, Charlotte West
 Southwest Baptist University: Rex Brown, James Sells
 Southwest Missouri State University: Bill O'Neill, Gregory P. Onstot, Bill Rowe, Mary Jo Wynn

Tulsa, University of: Bradley K. Beasley, John Benn, Barry A. Kinsey
 Wartburg College: John F. Kurtz
 Washburn University: Larry D. Blumberg, Janet Degginger, Jerry Robertson
 Washington University (Missouri): Philip Godfrey, Lynn C. Imergoot, Harry E. Kisker, John M. Schael
 Wayne State College (Nebraska): Peter Chapman
 Wichita State University: Warren Armstrong, Martin M. Perline, Tom Shupe

District 6

Abilene Christian University: A. Don Drennan, David B. Merrell
 Alcorn State University: Theophilus Danzy, Norris Allen Edney, Walter Washington
 Angelo State University: Kathleen Brasfield, Jerry Vandergriff
 Arkansas, University of, Fayetteville: J. Frank Broyles, Ruth Cohoon, Daniel E. Ferritor, Albert M. Witte
 Arkansas, University of, Little Rock: Kevin Anglin, Gary A. Heidt, Beadle Moore
 Arkansas State University: Bill Davidson, Sam R. Gennuso, Eugene W. Smith
 Baylor University: David Guinn, Bill Menefee
 Cameron University: Robert L. Ziegler
 Centenary College: Walter C. Stevens
 Central State University (Oklahoma): Bill J. Lillard, John E. Wagnon
 East Texas State University: Richard Fulkerson, Margaret Harbison
 Eastern New Mexico University: Paul Coggins, B. B. Lees, Robert L. Matheny
 Grambling State University: Fred C. Hobdy, Eddie Milton Jones
 Hardin-Simmons University: Jesse C. Fletcher
 Houston, University of: James R. Benbrook, Conrad Colbert, Rudy Davalos
 Houston Baptist University: Tollie M. Bibb, Jon A. Steinbrecher, James S. Taylor
 Jackson State University: Howard Davis, Mel Evans
 Lamar University: Sonny Jolly, Larry W. Spradley
 Louisiana Tech University: Pat Garrett
 McNeese State University: Robert G. Hayes, Robert Hebert, Charley W. Sparks
 Mississippi Valley State University: Reginald L. Henderson, Charles Prophet
 North Texas, University of: Irma J. Caton, J. Gail Curry, Richard McDuffie
 Northeast Louisiana University: Maynard M. Dolecheck, Benny Hollis, Dwight D. Vines
 Northwestern State University (Louisiana): Robert A. Alost, Tynes Hildebrand

Pan American University: Ronald L. Applbaum
 Prairie View A&M University: Brutus N. Jackson
 Rice University: James A. Castaneda, Alan J. Chapman, Jim Harris, Martha E. Hawthorne
 Sam Houston State University: Tom Davis, Matt Fenley, E. Rex Isham, Ron Randleman
 Southern Methodist University: Barbara Camp, Cynthia Patterson, C. Paul Rogers III, Doug Single
 Southern University, Baton Rouge: Marino H. Casem
 Southwest Texas State University: Dana L. Craft, Billy M. Miller
 Southwestern Louisiana, University of: Louie Alford, Ray P. Authement, Gerard L. St. Martin
 Stephen F. Austin State University: Jimmy L. Allison, Sadie Allison, Harold G. Hill, William R. Johnson, Steve McCarty, Baker Pattillo
 Texas, University of, Arlington: William E. Reeves, Bill Ross
 Texas, University of, Austin: Leon Black, DeLoss Dodds, Beverly Hadaway, Craig Helwig, Donna A. Lopiano, James W. Vick, James G. Worley
 Texas, University of, San Antonio: Daniel O. Hogenauer, Bobby Thompson
 Texas A&I University: Steven Altman, Pence Dacus
 Texas A&M University: Thomas W. Adair, John David Crow, Larry Dixon, William H. Mobley, Robert Smith
 Texas Christian University: Carolyn Dixon, Joseph W. Helmick, Mel Thomas, William E. Tucker, Frank Windegger
 Texas Southern University: Willie Criddle, Thurman W. Robins
 Texas Tech University: T. Jones, Robert M. Swezzy
 Texas Woman's University: Joanne Kuhn, G. Ann Uhlir
 Trinity University (Texas): Gene Norris
 West Texas State University: Bruce A. Grimes, F. C. Killebrew, Ed D. Roach

District 7

Boise State University: Gene Bleymaier, Carol Ladwig
 Brigham Young University: Clayne R. Jensen, Elaine Michaelis, Glen C. Tuckett, Lu Wallace
 Colorado College: Susan Ashley, Susan Bethanis, Richard L. Taber
 Colorado School of Mines: R. Bruce Allison, John A. Hogan
 Colorado State University: Chuck Bell, G. James Francis, L. Oval Jaynes
 Denver, University of: Craig Patrick, Terrence J. Toy, Diane T. Wendt
 Eastern Montana College: Randy Howard
 Gonzaga University: John Preston
 Hawaii, University of: Ted Livingston, Tracy Orillo, Stanley B. Sheriff
 Idaho, University of: Kathy Clark, W. Harold Godwin, Gary Hunter
 Idaho State University: Darold H. Chambers, Tom Jewell
 Montana, University of: Harley W. Lewis, Robert Lindsay, Kathy

Noble
 Montana State University: Edward L. Hanson, Virginia Hunt
 Nevada, University of, Reno: Joseph N. Crowley, Christopher H. Exline, Pharus Harper, Anne Hope
 New Mexico, University of: Linda K. Estes, Leon E. Griffin, Gary Ness
 Northern Arizona University: Tom Jurich, David Maritee, Sam F. McClanahan
 Regis College (Colorado): Thomas Dedin
 San Diego State University: Jayne Hancock, James G. Malik, Fred L. Miller
 Southern Utah State College: Kathryn Berg, David R. Braegger, Gary Gallup, Paul Ridings
 Texas, University of, El Paso: Richard W. Burns, Robert D. Tollen
 U.S. Air Force Academy: James C. Andrus, Col. John J. Clune, Col. Ruben A. Cubero, Richard P. Ellis
 Utah, University of: Arnold C. Ferrin Jr., Fern Gardner, Christopher P. Hill
 Weber State College: Robert H. DeBoer, Richard Ordyna, Mike Price, Leland Sather
 Wyoming, University of: David L. Baker, Joseph R. Geraud, Dan Viola

District 8

Alaska, University of, Anchorage: Donald F. Behrend, Jack Peterson, Ronald J. Petro
 Alaska, University of, Fairbanks: Ed Cridge, G. Lynn Lashbrook, Karen J. Morris
 Arizona, University of: Allan Beigel, Cedric W. Dempsey, Mary Roby, Robert W. Sankey
 Arizona State University: Bill Bryant, Jill DeMichele, Herman R. Frazier, Charles S. Harris, Jerry Kingston
 California, University of, Berkeley: Robert Driscoll, Carol Iwaoka, Thomas A. Jacobs, Luella J. Lilly, David L. Maggard, Robert F. Steidel Jr., Marie Tuite
 California, University of, Davis: Pamela L. Gill, Samuel H. Logan, Herb Schmalenberger, Larry Swanson
 California, University of, Irvine: John E. Caine, James H. Fallon, Robert L. Halvaks, Kaia Hedlund, Jack Peltason
 California, University of, Los Angeles: Peter T. Dalis, Douglas S. Hobbs, Judith R. Holland, Jim Milhorn, Michael Sondheimer, Charles E. Young
 California, University of, Riverside: James H. Erickson, Richard H. Perry, James J. Sims
 California, University of, San Diego: Earl W. Edwards, Michael Hipp, A. W. Russ, Judith M. Sweet
 California, University of, Santa Barbara: Michael T. Bowers, Alice Henry, Stanley M. Morrison, Barbara S. Uehling
 California, University of, Santa Cruz: Daniel T. Wood

California Institute of Technology: Warren G. Emery
 California Lutheran University: Robert Doering, Carla DuPuis
 California Polytechnic State University, San Luis Obispo: Frank Lebens, Marilyn McNeil, Kendrick W. Walker, Michael Wenzl
 California State Polytechnic University, Pomona: James Bell, David Brown, Karen L. Miller
 California State University, Bakersfield: Rudy Carvajal, Gloria Friedman, Richard W. Graves, George B. Hibbard
 California State University, Chico: Don D. Miller
 California State University, Dominguez Hills: John A. Brownell, Harold Charnofsky, Daniel G. Guerrero, Lou Murdock
 California State University, Fresno: Gary A. Cunningham, John Easterbrook, Diane Milutinovich, Peter Simis
 California State University, Fullerton: Edward O. Carroll, Leanne Grotke, Barbara S. Stone
 California State University, Hayward: Judith Hirsch, Alfred R. Mathews Jr., George H. Peterson
 California State University, Long Beach: Kay Don, Corey Johnson, Curtis L. McCray, Keith I. Polakoff
 California State University, Los Angeles: Carol M. Dunn, Fleur Yano
 California State University, Northridge: Judith M. Brame, Robert J. Hiebert, James Sefton
 California State University, Sacramento: Robert O. Bess, Calvin R. Boyes, Robert T. Olmstead Jr., Irene Shea
 California State University, San Bernardino: Reginald L. Price
 California State University, Stanislaus: Wayne S. Pierce, Jim Santos
 Chaminade University: T. Michael Hogan Jr., Ray Nagel, Mike Vasconcellos
 Chapman College: Walter Bowman, Penny Brush
 Claremont McKenna-Harvey Mudd-Scripps Colleges: Grayle W. Howlett
 Eastern Washington University: Darlene Bailey, Frank E. Nelson, Alexander Schilt
 Humboldt State University: Vern Henricks, Chuck Lindemann, Michael Wartell, John Yarnall
 Lewis and Clark College: Fred O. Wilson
 Loyola Marymount University: Lane Bove, James N. Loughran, Margaret P. Olaveson, Brian Quinn
 Mills College: Colleen Lim
 Nevada, University of, Las Vegas: Paul E. Burns, Christina L. Kunzer
 New Mexico State University: Karen Fey, James Fisher, Albert Gonzales, James E. Halligan
 Occidental College: Ralph Amey, Lynn M. Pacala, John B. Slaughter
 Oregon, University of: Bill Byrne, Chapin D. Clark, Gary Gray
 Oregon State University: John V. Byrne, Robert Frank, Lynn Snyder
 Pacific, University of the: Bill L. Atchley, Tom S. Stubbs
 Pepperdine University: John Watson, Wayne Wright
 Pomona-Pitzer Colleges: Edward W. Malan, Curtis W. Tong

Portland, University of: Joseph A. Etzel
 Portland State University: Roger Edgington, Robert W. Lockwood
 Redlands, University of: Christopher N. Walker, Pamela D. Walker
 St. Mary's College (California): Larry J. Marfise, Donald J. McKillip, William McLeod
 San Diego, University of: Thomas F. Burke, Author E. Hughes, Thomas Innacone
 San Francisco, University of: Rev. Robert A. Sunderland
 San Francisco State University: Kathy Argo, Lawrence Bliss, Samuel N. Goldman, William E. Partlow
 San Jose State University: Gail Fullerton, Randall G. Hoffman, Carolyn Lewis, Tony McDonnell, Charles Whitcomb, Mary M. Zimmerman
 Santa Clara University: Dan Curry, Thomas J. O'Connor
 Seattle Pacific University: Wesley Lingren, E. Dale Parker, Keith R. Phillips
 Sonoma State University: Ralph Barkey, David Benson
 Southern California, University of: Margaret Gatz, Barbara A. Hedges, Michael B. McGee, Donald L. Winston, James H. Zumberge
 Stanford University: Tom Beckett, Ferdinand A. Geiger, Cheryl L. Levick, Jerry I. Porras
 U.S. International University: Al J. Palmiotto
 Utah State University: Stanford Cazier, E. Kaye Hart, Michael Parent, Rod Tueller
 Washington, University of: Richard J. Dunn, Catherine B. Green, Milo R. Lude
 Washington State University: Edward M. Bennett, Jim Livengood, Marcia L. Saneholtz
 Whittier College: Sherry Calvert, David A. Jacobs

Conference Members

American South Athletic Conference: Doug Abel, Craig Thompson
 Association of Mid-Continent Universities: Arnold D. Fielkow, Jerry A. Ippoliti
 Atlantic Coast Conference: Eugene F. Corrigan, Jonathan B. LeCrone, David V. Thompson, Delores S. Todd
 Atlantic 10 Conference: Ron Bertovich, Cindy Mazda
 Big East Conference: Linda M. Bruno, David R. Gavitt
 Big Eight Conference: Prentice Gautt, Carl C. James
 Big Sky Conference: Sharon M. Holmberg, Ronald D. Stephenson
 Big South Conference: Shane Lyons, Edward M. Singleton
 Big Ten Conference: John D. Dewey, Wayne Duke, Phyllis L. Howlett, Betsy J. Mosher, Clarence Underwood Jr.
 Big West Conference: Dennis A. Farrell, James Haney, Paula Y. Smith
 California Collegiate Athletic Association: Tom D. Morgan
 *Central Collegiate Hockey Association: Bill Beagan
 Central Intercollegiate Athletic Association: Bob Moorman

City University of New York Athletic Conference: Michael Steuerman
 College Athletic Conference: Charles Vahlkamp
 College Conference of Illinois and Wisconsin: Jack Swartz
 Colonial Athletic Association: Timothy Dillon, Thomas E. Yeager
 *The Colonial League: Alan W. Childs
 Dixie Intercollegiate Athletic Conference: Donald L. Scalf
 East Coast Conference: Ernest C. Casale
 Eastern College Athletic Conference: Clayton W. Chapman, Robert M. Whitelaw, Richard B. Yoder
 Eastern College Athletic Conference North Atlantic: Stuart P. Haskell Jr.
 Gateway Collegiate Athletic Conference: Patricia Viverito
 Great Lakes Intercollegiate Athletic Conference: Vern L. Norris
 *Great Northwest Conference: Elwood B. Hahn
 Gulf South Conference: G. E. Moran
 *Heartland Collegiate Conference: John J. Hinga
 High Country Athletic Conference: Margie McDonald
 Ivy Group Presidents, Council of: Constance Huston, Jeffrey H. Orleans
 Lone Star Conference: Ollie S. Cauthen, Shirley Morton
 Massachusetts State College Athletic Conference: F. Paul Bogan
 Metro Atlantic Athletic Conference: Richard J. Ensor
 Metropolitan Collegiate Athletic Conference: Ralph McFillen, R. Dale Smith
 Michigan Intercollegiate Athletic Association: Albert L. Deal
 Mid-American Athletic Conference: James W. Lessig, Jamie McCloskey
 Mid-Eastern Athletic Conference: Kenneth A. Free
 Middle Atlantic States Collegiate Athletic Conference: Nathan N. Salant
 Midwest Athletic Conference for Women: Diane Fairchild
 Midwest Collegiate Athletic Conference: Ralph L. Shively
 Midwestern Collegiate Conference: Bret A. Gilliland, James W. Shaffer
 Missouri Intercollegiate Athletic Association: Ken B. Jones
 Missouri Valley Conference: J. Douglas Elgin, Joseph F. Mitch
 New England Collegiate Conference: William M. Leete Jr.
 New England Women's 8: Virginia Evans
 New Jersey Athletic Conference: John K. Adams
 New York State Women's Collegiate Athletic Association: Dolores A. Bogard
 North Central Intercollegiate Athletic Conference: Noel W. Olson
 North Coast Athletic Conference: Dennis Collins
 North Star Conference: Jean L. Ponsetto
 Northeast Conference: Chris Monasch, Robert Steitz
 Northeast-Ten Conference: Elwood N. Shields
 Northern California Athletic Conference: James P. Jorgensen
 Ohio Athletic Conference: James W. Lessig
 Ohio Valley Conference: Donald G. Combs

Pacific-10 Conference: Melva Hansen, Thomas C. Hansen, Christine Hoyles, Duane P. Lindberg, Mike Matthews, John McCasey, David Price, Novian Whitsitt

Pennsylvania State Athletic Conference: Charles A. Eberle

Southeastern Conference: Brad Davis, Charles Davis, James L.

McCullough, Harvey W. Schiller, Patricia W. Wall, Mark Womack

Southern Conference: Dave Hart Sr., Wright Waters

Southern Intercollegiate Athletic Conference: James E. Hawkins

Southland Conference: Don Graham, Donald C. Landry

Southwest Athletic Conference: Fred Jacoby, Kevin Lennon, Susan Zinn

Southwestern Athletic Conference: James Frank

State University of New York Athletic Conference: Stephen P. Erber

Sun Belt Conference: Victor A. Bubas, John Iamarino

Sunshine State Conference: Bob Vanatta

Trans America Athletic Conference: Lou McCullough

University Athletic Association: Richard Rasmussen

West Coast Athletic Conference: Michael M. Gilleran, Don Ott

Western Athletic Conference: Jeff Hurd, Joseph L. Kearney, Dee Anne Menzies

*Western Collegiate Hockey Association: Otto Breitenbach

*Western Football Conference: Victor A. Buccola, Don Wilson

Wisconsin State University Conference: Max R. Sparger

Wisconsin Women's Intercollegiate Athletic Conference: Judy Kruckman

Women's Intercollegiate Athletic Conference: Kitty R. Baird

*Nonvoting

Affiliated Members

Amateur Basketball Association of the USA: William L. Wall

American Baseball Coaches Association: Elaine Miles, Jerry A. Miles

American Volleyball Coaches Association: Grant Burger, Sandra L. Vivas

American Water Polo Coaches Association: John Tanner

California Association of Community Colleges: Walter C. Rilliet

College Division Commissioners Association: Patrick R. Damore

College Football Association: Charles M. Neinas, Dave Ogrea

Golf Coaches Association of America: Doug Gordin

Intercollegiate Tennis Coaches Association: Stanley J. Clark

Metropolitan Intercollegiate Basketball Association: George R. Bisacca, John J. Powers

National Association of Academic Advisors for Athletics: Robert Bradley

National Association of Basketball Coaches: Joseph R. Vancisin

National Association of Collegiate Directors of Athletics: Michael J. Cleary, Timothy W. Gleason

National Football Foundation and Hall of Fame: Jimmie McDowell,

Bill Pearce

National Soccer Coaches Association: Johnson D. Bowie

United States Fencing Coaches Association: Alfred Peredo

Women's Basketball Coaches Association: Gooch Foster, Betty Jaynes, Regina Sullivan

Women's Intercollegiate Cross Country Coaches Association: Carol Stevenson

Corresponding Members

Andrus Group, The: Sharon Andrus, Joyce L. Kuhn, Sue Ann Lane

Astro Turf Industries, Inc.: Ed M. Milner

Athletes in Action: Rle Nichols

Charleston, College of: Andrew L. Abrams, Jerry Baker

Meadowlands Sports Complex: Michael Rowe, Leslie H. Unger

Missouri, University of, Kansas City: Floyd A. Walker

Northeastern Illinois University: Dale DeVille, Dennis Keihn

Peach Bowl, Inc.: Robert D. Morgan

Pratt Institute: Eugene Marshall

York College (New York): Stuart Bailin

Visitors

All American Bowl: Jim Simmons

American Institutes for Research: Terry R. Armstrong, George W.

Bohrnstedt, David A. Goslin, Robert J. Rossi

David Carrigan and Associates, Inc.: David B. Carrigan

Clifford, Mark

Creative Sports Marketing: Bray Cary

Drew Pearson Enterprises: Ken Shead

Elder Sports Management and Instructional Institute: Rhonda

Anderson, Lorraine C. Kennedy

Fiesta Bowl: Bruce Skinner

Florida State University System: Charles B. Reed

Freedom Bowl: Kirk Hendrix, Jack Lindquist, Tom Starr

Guilford College: Alan Platt

Hall of Fame Bowl: Larry Baldwin, Jim McVay

Harsh, Emily H.

HOK Sports Facilities Group: Don Loudermilk, Dick Martin, Rick Martin

Ilikai Hotel: Tom Herman

Intercollegiate Athletics Consultants: Michael L. Garnes

John Hancock Sun Bowl: Sam Jenkins

Kurdemeier, Gary

Lenoir Rhyne College: Keith Ochs

Liberty Bowl: A. F. Dudley

Livingston, Jack

Meier, James R.

Mississippi Institutions of Higher Learning: Frank Crothwait

Mobil Cotton Bowl: Jim Brock, Jim Williams Jr.

Molton, Allen & Williams Corporation: William M. Jacka

Oahu Travel Inc.: Pam Goodman
 Orange Bowl: Jim Barker, Peter Fay, Steven J. Hatchell, Tom Wood
 Pacific Rim Classic: Tom Ruffen
 Pasadena Tournament of Roses: Jack Biggar, James B. Boyle Jr.,
 Harriman Cronk, Millard Davidson, Jack French, Stanley Hahn,
 Arthur D. Welsh
 Raycom, Inc.: Ken Haines, Lynn Thorneburg
 Raycom Management Group: Richard Giannini
 Rose Research & Consulting: David Rose
 Sea World Holiday Bowl: John K. Reid
 South Carolina, University of, Spartanburg: Daniel J. Codespoti,
 Tom Pucci
 Spectacor Management Group: Bill Curl
 Sunkist Fiesta Bowl: Phil Motta
 Tele Planning International, Inc.: Kunimasa Matsuda, Masaru
 Yanaka
 The Athletics Congress: Berny Wagner
 U.S. Gymnastics Federation: John Arends
 USA Volleyball: Debbie Hunter
 USF&G Sugar Bowl: Jim Flower, Mickey Holmes
 Worsley, Roger

Working News Media

Amusement Business: Linda Deckard
 Associated Press: David Carpenter, Doug Tucker, Steve Wilstein
 Atlanta Journal-Constitution: David Davidson
 Baltimore Morning Sun: Mark Hyman
 Baton Rouge State Times: George Morris
 Bradley Photographers: James T. Bradley
 CBS Radio Networks: Robert Kipperman, Frank D. Murphy
 CBS Sports: Mark Carlson, Len DeLuca, Neal Pilon
 Cable News Network: David Butterfield, Greg LeFevre, Kevin
 Rockwell
 Chronicle of Higher Education: Doug Lederman, Susan Oberlander,
 Karen Preuss
 College Football Hall of Fame: Pat Harmon
 Contra Costa Times: Chuck Dybdal, Gary Peterson
 Dallas Morning News: Doug Bedell, Ivan Maisel
 Dallas Times Herald: Dan Langendorf
 Dayton Daily News: Ritter Collett
 Des Moines Register: Tom Witosky
 ESPN: Steve Bornstein, John Hamlin, Loren Matthews, Chris
 Myers, Tom Odjakian, Steve Risser, Rick Tullis
 Florida Times-Union: Sandra Fish, Don Yaeger
 Fort Worth Star-Telegram: Jimmy Burch
 Jefferson-Pilot Teleproductions: Ed Hull
 KCBS Radio: Paula Drake, Hal Ramsey, Mike Woodley
 KGO Radio: Joe Starkey
 Kansas City Star & Times: Dennis Dodd

Las Vegas Sun: Steve Carp
 Los Angeles Times: Jerry Crowe
 Memphis Commercial Appeal: Al Dunning
 NBC: Jeff Cokin, Jon Miller
 Nashville Banner: Fred Russell
 Nashville Tennessean: David Climer
 New York Times: Bill Rhoden
 Newsday: Manny Topol
 Oakland Tribune: Jim Bainbridge, Monte Poole
 Orange County Register: Michele Himmelberg
 Peninsula Times Tribune: Leonard Koppett, Rick LaPlante
 Raleigh News & Observer: Chip Alexander
 Raycom Sports: Rick Ray
 Richmond Times-Dispatch: Jerry Lindquist
 Roanoke Times & World-News: Bill Brill
 Sacramento Bee: Bob Burns
 San Diego Tribune: Tom Cushman, Ed Zierlski
 San Diego Union: Chris Jenkins
 San Francisco Chronicle: Pam King
 San Francisco Examiner: Dwight Chapin, Joan Ryan
 San Francisco Progress: Bill Paterson
 San Jose Mercury News: John Rawlings
 Scripps Howard News Service: Marvin West
 Skinner's International News Services: Sam Skinner
 Soccer America Magazine: Ridge Mahoney
 Sports Illustrated: Robert Sullivan
 Sports inc.: Gregg Krupa, Ian McDonald
 Sports Perspectives International: Charles Farrell
 The Targum: Kelly Whiteside
 Turner Broadcasting System: Kevin O'Malley, Jim Trahey, Robert
 Wussler
 USA Today: Fred Baer, Denise Tom, Steve Wieberg
 United Press International: Mark Jeong, Bill Murray
 Washington Post: Mark Asher

83rd Annual Convention Opening Business Session

Sunday Afternoon, January 8, 1989

The 83rd annual Convention of the National Collegiate Athletic Association, meeting at the San Francisco Hilton, San Francisco, California, January 8-11, 1989, was called to order at 4:37 p.m., with President Wilford S. Bailey, Auburn University, presiding.

OPENING REMARKS

President Bailey: Will the delegates please find a chair and be seated. As president of the NCAA, it is my distinct pleasure to welcome you to San Francisco and to the 83rd annual NCAA Convention. As you know, our meetings are conducted under the procedures prescribed by Robert's Rules of Order, Newly Revised. One such procedure is the need to adopt the Convention Program prior to the beginning of our business. I will ask now for a motion to adopt the printed program of this Convention.

James W. Lessig (Mid-American Athletic Conference): On behalf of the NCAA Council, I move adoption of the 1989 Convention Program as printed and with the approval of the NCAA Council that the agenda be reordered so that legislative Proposal Nos. 53 and 52 be reversed, so that Proposal No. 53 is acted upon prior to Proposal No. 52.

[The motion was seconded and approved.]

President Bailey: Robert's Rules of Order provides that procedures therein may be superseded or replaced by an organization's own traditional and customary procedures. Our Association has a number of such procedures, and several of them are reviewed in the introduction section of your program. Those also appeared in the Official Notice of the Convention, mailed to you in November. In addition, you will find in your program a reference listing of all of the Association's legislation dealing with our Conventions. All of the NCAA's Convention procedures are designed to assure fairness and equitable treatment for all members, as well as to eliminate any questions of impropriety and to expedite your work as delegates. I will not take the time today to explain all of the parliamentary procedures used to assure fairness. I will remind the delegates, however, that the chair fully intends to apply those procedures throughout. We will, for example, be aware of the number of times an individual speaks on a given issue and the length of time taken by any one speaker, both matters controlled by Robert's Rules of Order.

Also, any motion to table that is designed to prevent debate or to kill a motion is dilatory and thus will be ruled out of order. Only a two-thirds majority of this body can suppress debate on any circularized proposal.

There are certain other procedures we employ in attempting to use our time efficiently. In all of the business sessions, the chair will attempt to "eyeball" as many votes as possible, calling for a count by the Voting Committee only when there is doubt as to the majority. I ask all delegates to refrain from calling for a vote count unless one seems necessary to determine the disposition of the issues. If one is called, that request will, of course, be granted. If delegates intend to debate an issue in any business session, we ask that they be at one of the microphone locations and prepared to speak when the motion has been made and seconded. If the chair sees no one at a microphone, the vote will be called as quickly as possible. The microphones will be numbered for our general business session, and I will use those numbers to recognize the speakers. Every effort will be made to recognize speakers in the order they come to the microphones, but I think you can appreciate the fact that in the auditorium of this size and shape that may not always be possible. On bylaw issues in the general business session, the chair will call for the vote in the same division sequence each time: Division I first, followed by Division II, and then Division III. The results of a division's vote will not be announced until all divisions have voted.

Each year, in this session, we review the voting and speaking privileges for the NCAA Conventions. Each active member institution may have four accredited delegates, one voting and three alternates. They may exchange the voting privilege among them because all have been approved as voters by the chief executive officer of the institution. Active members also may have visiting delegates if they desire, but those visitors may not participate in the Convention in terms of speaking or voting. Member conferences that have voting privileges in accordance with the constitution have the same voting and speaking privileges as active members. A member conference that does not have a vote, and any affiliated organization, may have one official delegate who is permitted to speak but not to vote. We ask that these individuals identify themselves and their affiliation clearly when they rise to speak. Those delegates wearing Convention badges with ribbons are permitted to speak. Those without ribbons are visitors and may not participate other than as observers.

Finally, this is the first Convention for the new "window of reconsideration" approach. In the general business session Wednesday, immediately after we act on the consent packages, I will call for any motions to reconsider anything adopted by the division business sessions on Tuesday. That will be the only time that a division decision from Tuesday can be reconsidered in the general business session. All reconsideration motions involving actions in the division business sessions must either occur in those division sessions or in that "window of reconsideration" Wednesday morning.

CONVENTION COMMITTEES

It is now my privilege to identify for you the several Convention committees and the chair of each. The Nominating Committee chair is Kathleen M. McNally of La Salle University. The Men's Committee on Committees is chaired by Charles Whitcomb of San Jose State University. The Women's Committee on Committees is chaired by Judith R. Holland, University of California, Los Angeles. The Voting Committee chair is Leanne Grotke, California State University, Fullerton. The Committee on Credentials chair is Charles Prophet, Mississippi Valley State University. The Memorial Resolutions Committee is chaired by Bradford W. Hovious, Texas, El Paso. He is not able to be here today and will be represented by acting chair Joanne A. Fortunato of Keene State College.

In accordance with NCAA procedures, the reports of the sports committees and general committees are not presented orally but are included in the printed Annual Reports. The report of the secretary-treasurer and of the Executive Committee also appear in the Annual Reports. At the beginning of the general business session Wednesday morning, we will entertain motions to receive and approve those reports.

REPORT OF COUNCIL

We move now to the report of the NCAA Council for 1987. To present that report, I am pleased to introduce a member of the Council whose term, unfortunately, is ending with this Convention. He has been an extremely valuable member of the Council, and his work during the past year in the area of minority opportunities in college athletics has been outstanding. He also is a former member of the Presidents Commission. I am honored to present to you the president of Kentucky State University, Raymond M. Burse.

Raymond M. Burse (Kentucky State University): I am pleased to have the opportunity to present this year's Council Report to the 1989 Convention. As President Bailey noted, I am concluding my service on the Council; and while it sometimes is difficult for a university president to devote the time and attention required by that involvement, I have gained a great deal of appreciation for the dedication, commitment and sincerity of those who do serve in the leadership positions in this Association.

This annual report is required by the provisions of the NCAA constitution. It is a brief report of the major Council actions during 1988. The full report of all Council actions during the year is available to you from two sources. One is The NCAA News, which publishes after each Council meeting a complete listing of the Council's actions. The other source is the printed publication entitled 1987-88 Annual Reports, which is distributed here at the Convention and also mailed to each member institution.

For the third straight year, many of the Council's more significant involvements have been the result of the work of special Council

subcommittees, which deal with specific, timely topics, requiring in-depth analysis and resolutions. That subcommittee process began in 1986, and it continues to be an effective device today. This year, we took major actions on recommendations of three committees.

The Special Committee to Review Opportunities for Ethnic Minorities in Intercollegiate Athletics, a committee which I had the privilege of chairing, developed an enhancement program for ethnic minorities that now, for the most part, has been implemented. Following the lead of this special subcommittee, the standing NCAA Committee on Women's Athletics developed similar recommendations to enhance opportunities for women in college athletics: As a result, we now have in place a program of postgraduate scholarships, NCAA national office internships and development of a national vita bank for both ethnic minorities and women. It is my firm hope that this effort will prove successful in addressing what all of us in higher education consider to be and know to be a major problem area.

Another special Council subcommittee, this one with the somewhat unwieldy name of Special Council Subcommittee to Stimulate the Membership's Compliance and Enforcement Efforts, successfully recommended in 1988 that a series of compliance forums be held nationwide. That was approved by the Council. It is my opinion that the NCAA's increased efforts to assist the member institutions and conferences in complying with the Association's rules and regulations is one of the most promising developments in college athletics today.

A special committee, not a Council subcommittee in this case, has been appointed to review the NCAA membership structure. This committee is important, and far-reaching work has begun. Also, late in the year, a Special Committee to Review Amateurism Issues was appointed. The work of both of these committees promises to be major topics in 1989.

The Council has continued to support the Presidents Commission in its National Forum activities. Also, the NCAA officers met with the officers of the Commission twice in 1988. From one of those meetings, came support for the Commission's appointment of an advisory committee to review the NCAA governance process, especially the legislative aspects and the involvement of chief executive officers.

One other major thrust coming from the 1988 Council is among the legislative proposals to be voted on at this Convention. It is the concept of slowing down the legislative process itself, so more time is available to refine proposed legislation and hopefully to reduce the volume of legislation with which we deal. Proposal Nos. 47 and 48 at this Convention give you, the membership, the opportunity to establish a new legislative calendar for submitting amendments, which includes an expanded process for reviewing and refining legislation.

The Council also is sponsoring legislation to create for the first time a formal opportunity for those individuals most important to all of us, student-athletes, to have an input into athletics matters. Proposal

No. 77 would create a standing Student-Athlete Advisory Committee, and we commend that proposal to you.

There is the opportunity in Proposal No. 69 to adopt a long-awaited revision of the much discussed, much maligned, often misunderstood NCAA Manual. President Bailey and his special committee deserve an immense amount of credit for this product of more than three and one-half years of time, effort and detail work, which continues even as this Convention begins. The Council has reviewed the progress of the Manual revision at each of its meetings for the past three years, and we believe that the proposed new book is a great enhancement and improvement over the existing Manual.

At each of the Council meetings, the Council spends much of its time dealing with proposed legislation, interpretations of NCAA rules, necessary membership actions and other matters, often quite detailed, that come under the authority of the Council and the division steering committees. Decisions on those matters that I have referenced before are reflected in the Council action reports in The NCAA News.

President Bailey, I believe I have summarized the major issues before the Council during the past year; and on Wednesday morning at the beginning of the general business session, there will be a motion to have the Convention accept and approve the Council's full report for 1988.

REPORT OF THE MEMORIAL RESOLUTIONS COMMITTEE

President Bailey: At this point in the agenda, we will have the report of the Memorial Resolutions Committee. We request all delegates, visitors and friends, and the news media to please remain silent during the reading of the Memorial Resolutions list. I present Joanne Fortunato, Keene State College, the acting chair of the Memorial Resolutions Committee, for this report.

Joanne A. Fortunato (Keene State College): At this time, I would like to recognize the other members of the Memorial Resolutions Committee. They are Bradford W. Hovious, University of Texas, El Paso, and Reginald L. Price, California State University, San Bernardino. Following is a list of those men and women who have passed away during the past year. They are:

William C. Ackerman, University of California, Los Angeles
Ermal G. Allen, University of Kentucky
Clary Anderson, Montclair State College
Percy E. Arthur, Rice University
Eddie Barbour, University of Detroit
Robert W. Bedell, State University of New York, Buffalo
Sylvester J. Blum, Bucknell University
Ed Brown, Southern Connecticut State University
Edmund M. Cameron, Duke University
Frank Candida, California State University, Los Angeles
Henry A. Ciccarone, Johns Hopkins University

Andrew H. Cohen, University of Texas, El Paso
Michael I. Cohen, New York Institute of Technology
Thomas C. Coker, Bradley University
Cecil N. Coleman Jr., Midwestern Collegiate Conference
H. Phillip Constans, University of Florida
Glenn V. Cunningham, Cornell College (Iowa)
Gerry D'Agostino, Brockport State University College
Joseph E. Davies, Colorado School of Mines
Roy Dennis, Occidental College
Robert J. Dewey, University of Rochester
Robert L. Dodd, Georgia Institute of Technology
George E. Doherty, Northwestern State University (Louisiana)
Roland D. Dotsch, Northern Michigan University
Elvin C. Drake, University of California, Los Angeles
David B. Eavenson Sr., Dickinson College
Thomas W. Eck, University of Massachusetts, Amherst
James H. Ely, State University of New York, Buffalo
Harvey L. Griffin, Oklahoma State University
Henry B. Hardt, Texas Christian University
Stephen Harrick, West Virginia University
Cecil L. Hartman, University of Nebraska, Omaha
Glenn W. Holcomb, Oregon State University
Douglas L. Holmquist, University of Central Florida
Hobart Hooser, University of Florida
Russell E. Houk, Bloomsburg University of Pennsylvania
Joseph W. Hutton Sr., Hamline University
Nell C. Jackson, State University of New York, Binghamton
Thurmon L. Jones, Texas A&M University
C. H. Kellogg, Regis College
W. Glenn Killinger, Dickinson College
Clifford W. Kirms, Stevens Institute of Technology
James H. Leighton, Wake Forest University
Walter H. Lemm, Carroll College (Wisconsin)
Paul S. Leitz, Loyola University (Illinois)
Charles F. Martin, Northeast Louisiana University
Richard D. McBride, University of California, Santa Barbara
Andrew J. McDonald, Southwest Missouri State University
Bruce J. Melin, Washington University (Missouri)
Emil H. Messikomer, West Chester University of Pennsylvania
Tom Miner, University of Tulsa
Charlie N. Morrison, Union College (New York)
J. Edward Mullen Jr., Marquette University
William E. Narduzzi, Columbia University
Joseph C. O'Connor, La Salle University
Adolph M. Olson, University of Wisconsin, Eau Claire
Chester W. Phillips, U.S. Naval Academy
James Pittenger, University of Nebraska, Lincoln
Russell Poel, North Central College
Lynn Rosenback, Washington State University

William J. Schaeffler, University of Denver
 Tillman R. Sease Sr., Howard University
 Thomas F. Stark, Winona State University
 Willis J. Stetson, Swarthmore College
 Donna J. Terry, University of California, Berkeley
 Robert J. Townsend, Williams College
 William J. Uhls, Southeast Missouri State University
 Robert W. Walters, La Salle University
 Charlie Way, University of Dayton
 Jo Ann Williams, St. Andrews Presbyterian College
 John P. Williamson, University of California, Berkeley
 James F. Wilson, University of Dayton
 Bennie L. Witherspoon, Northwest Missouri State University
 Brig. Gen. William H. Wood, U.S. Military Academy
 Bill Wright, University of Tennessee, Chattanooga

Will you, please, stand and observe a moment of silence for those gone before us.

President Bailey: The Memorial Resolutions Committee will present a supplementary report prior to the end of this Convention.

We now come to a feature that we introduced at last year's Convention, one that was received very well and now will be an annual feature of the Convention. We believe it both appropriate and important for the membership to have our executive director present an annual summary of conditions of the Association and college athletics in general. It is now my pleasure to present to you for the state of the Association address, our executive director, Dick Schultz.

STATE OF THE ASSOCIATION

Richard D. Schultz (NCAA): Mr. President, members on the dias and delegates: Welcome to San Francisco and the 83rd annual Convention. I was surprised to find and a little shocked to know that this is going to be an annual affair now. I thought this was only an encore from last year. It is a pleasure to have this opportunity to share some thoughts with you and to give you an update on the state of the Association and intercollegiate athletics as I see it. It has been about a year and one-half now since I actively became involved in this job on a day-to-day basis; and just like your jobs, it has had its challenges. It has had its good days and its bad days. Like all of you, I hope that the good days exceed the bad. But, I have to say honestly that I have enjoyed this job more than I thought I would. At the time it all came about, I had the feeling that it was something I was supposed to do and something that I probably would not enjoy. But as the year and one-half has gone on, basically because of many people, not the least of who are you who are sitting out there today, this job has been far more enjoyable than I thought it could be.

First of all, I have had an excellent group of officers to work with. The division vice-presidents—Al Witte, who will be going off the Council; also Bud Elwell in Division II, and Alvin Van Wie in

Division III—they do a great job of representing your interests in the division steering committees and on the Council. You all should take time to give them a big thank you when you have an opportunity. I have to give special thanks to Tom Frericks, our secretary-treasurer, and Wil Bailey, not only because they were vital to me in this transition and in helping me to adjust to this job and helping me to deal with the many challenges that are out there, but also because of the tremendous contributions they personally have made to this Association.

Tom Frericks, as secretary-treasurer, has been a great asset to everyone and me especially. He has had to survive two surgeries, including bypass surgery, to continue his duties. I hope I didn't have too much to do with that, Tom. (Laughter)

Wil Bailey, as secretary-treasurer for two years and these last two years as president, has made a tremendous, positive contribution to intercollegiate athletics, not only as president of the NCAA, but also as chair on the committee to deregulate our Association and write a new Manual.

With that, I would like to recognize several committees of the many that we have that I think have made some special contributions this past year. I have to start with the Bailey committee on deregulation. I am not going to take the time now to recognize the members of that committee, but it has been virtually an impossible task. It started out as something that could be handled in perhaps a year; it took three and one-half years. I think those of you who have seen the revised Manual realize what a great improvement it is and what a tremendous amount of work it was. When that issue comes up on Tuesday, I hope that it will be adopted by acclamation. President Burse mentioned several other committees. I just would like to touch on what I think was a tremendous job by the ethnic minority subcommittee and by the women's committee. I mentioned a year ago that I felt as an Association and as individual colleges and universities, we needed to be very concerned and we needed to do more to create proper access and opportunity for ethnic minorities and women. I said I felt that the Association and the national office should take a leadership role, realizing that we do not have the ability to dictate hiring practices. But what people are asking for is an opportunity, an opportunity to show you what their skills are and what their backgrounds are. With that opportunity, they hope for an opportunity to be employed in a meaningful position in athletics. Both the ethnic minority subcommittee and the women's committee have done an outstanding job in providing that leadership and seeing that the programs are in place. But that is just the first step. Now, it is our responsibility as individual people of authority responsible for hiring practices to take advantage of those things that have been put in place and to be sure that we, in each of our institutions, are providing proper access.

I mentioned also last year at this meeting that I felt we needed more flexibility in our rules, especially as they apply to the student-athlete. You responded by passing legislation last year that gave the Council,

through a special committee, an opportunity to review special cases regarding Bylaw 5-1-(j), the initial eligibility rule. That committee has done a tremendous job this year and has righted many inequities that existed because of the broad base of that legislation. I don't know off the top of my head the exact number of cases that it has reviewed, but it has been substantial. I think this is an important new aspect to the way this Association does its business.

At the same time, you responded by providing more flexibility in dealing with crises issues that face our staffs and especially our student-athletes. We eliminated the "funeral rule." We have had a number of situations this year where a member institution has called, an athlete had a tragedy or there was a tragedy on a team, transportation needed to be provided; and many cases, a decision was provided with a simple phone call. In most cases, it probably was resolved within at least an hour. We don't have a "Steve Alford rule" any more. You are free to use your athletes and the athletes are free to be publicized on bona fide charitable calendars. So, we have come a long way in the year, but we are not there yet. We will talk more about that later.

The Executive Committee in 1988 dealt with the problem it had been struggling with for several years; how to deal with the lack of office space in the national office. For those of you who have visited the office, you have known for years that the Association has functioned out of two buildings and for the last three or four years has been leasing in excess of 20,000 square feet outside of those two buildings. The Association owns those two office buildings. The Executive Committee, after exhaustive study and in looking at five cities outside the metropolitan Kansas City area, decided that it was in the best interest of the Association to remain in the greater Kansas City area. You might be interested in knowing that the bidding for the site to build that new building was so competitive—and the decision was made to lease and not own the new facility—that the Executive Committee has been successful in negotiating a new long-term lease that will allow us new office space at approximately \$2 a foot less than we are owning and operating the buildings that we currently are in. An outstanding feature of that new building will be a visitors center. I think as the years go by that we will find that this will be a tremendous thing for intercollegiate athletics and a very positive situation for the Association.

I thought you might also be interested in knowing what my activities have been like this past year since we met. When I was hired, the Executive Committee said it wanted an executive director who was willing to be visible and willing to spend time with the people and deal with problems straight up. Since our last Convention, I have been on the road 163 days. Fifty-nine of those days have been on your college campuses. Those have been some of the most positive days that I have had. When I have made those campus visits, in most instances, I have had the opportunity of spending time with members of your governing boards, with your chief executive officers, your

faculty representatives, athletics directors and so forth. One of the major thrusts of those visits has been to strengthen the position of the chief executive officer and those who are responsible for administering athletics programs on a day-to-day basis. It also has been very helpful in listening and hearing what your concerns are and being able to take those back to the Council and Executive Committee and make a bona fide effort in dealing with those. Twenty-two of those 163 days were spent with the conferences; 24 with other educational associations; and 59 days on other Association business, including the Council and Executive Committee meetings and various speaking engagements. I plan to continue that pace.

As I said to the staff, I think that we have a window of opportunity to make some positive things happen in intercollegiate athletics. But that window of opportunity will stay open only as long as the lines of communication are effective. I think that for the next few years I can be much more effective as your executive director by spending more time with you than behind the desk in Mission, Kansas.

We have some exciting things coming up in the next few days; even though, as you will see by the agenda, it probably is not what would be considered a controversial Convention. We start tomorrow with the final segment of the Presidents Commission National Forum. As you have read in The NCAA News and your own newspapers, the study that was commissioned a year and a half ago has been concluded, at least the first phases of that. I think you will find that information extremely interesting. Some newspapers have dealt with that very thoroughly; others have not. I think that you will find new things of value to you in intercollegiate athletics by attending that Forum tomorrow and hearing about research and taking part in the discussions. It is probably the most conclusive and massive amount of information that ever has been accumulated on intercollegiate athletics.

More than 4,000 individuals were interviewed. I think you will find the comparisons between the student-athletes and the student who is involved daily in other extracurricular activities to be very interesting and in many cases very similar, both on the plus side and on the minus side. So be sure you take part in that Forum. We also have taken steps to follow these individuals so that we can have some valuable longitudinal studies that will provide good, positive, useful information to this Association for a number of years.

There are a number of legislative issues that I would like to point out to you that I think are important. President Burse mentioned some. I would like to highlight those again. We do have two issues on financial aid that will be dealt with, Proposals 39 and 40. Financial aid has attracted a lot of media attention. A lot of things have been said about financial aid and what the needs are. You have an opportunity to deal with those at this Convention.

In Division III, Proposals 45 and 46, once again, address an issue that has been debated for a long time in Division III. Even though financial aid is based on need, the issue still arises whether athletics

ability should be considered in awarding that aid. This has been a major discussion and a major issue in Division III. Are we reaching that time in our history when we are going to have a Division III-A and III-AA? Division III will have to deal with that at this Convention.

The legislative calendar has been mentioned. There are two proposals in your booklet, Proposal No. 47, which deals with the biennial calendar, and Proposal No. 48. The Council felt that because of the lack of interest in No. 47 that this should be withdrawn and the effort should be concentrated on No. 48. Don't worry about the dates that appear there. You will have an opportunity to present amendments to amendments to change those dates if they are not right. But the theory behind the legislative calendar is very important. It is the first step in doing some major renovating of our legislative process, because it not only presents the opportunity of reducing the amendments—the quantity of legislation—but it also presents a real opportunity to improve the quality of the legislation. You will have some time to debate those issues, to discuss them, and decide what you like and what you don't like. Hopefully, those things that don't have much support will be withdrawn before they ever get on the Convention floor.

Proposal No. 75 is equally important because it addresses the issue of amendments to the amendments. Today, one institution can present an amendment to the amendment at the 11th hour that can change the total concept of that piece of legislation. In some cases, that is good; but many times, good legislation is destroyed because of attached amendments to the amendment. This proposal would require the same number of people to sponsor amendments to the amendments that sponsor legislation originally. I think that to improve the quality of the legislation with the expanded calendar it is very important to go forward with that.

Because I mentioned at this Convention a year ago the importance of involving the student-athlete in the affairs of this Association, I have to mention again Proposal No. 77, which creates that opportunity. I hope you will support that. It is time that our student-athletes are consulted and have an opportunity to react to the things that we are saying are in their best interest.

There are a number of issues out there that we need to deal with. This is why you, as well as the Council, need to deal with them. A year ago I talked about greater federation. I talked about philosophy and the importance of each institution determining its own philosophy based on its own institutional guidelines and financial resources. We followed up on that, with help of staff, with a paper we gave to the Council dealing with both structure and procedures. The Council has followed with legislation and, more importantly, with the appointment of a special committee to deal with the structure of this Association. That committee's work is very broad. I think it represents every interest group that we have, and the committee will meet with all those interest groups. Hopefully, it can take your thoughts, meld those and fine-tune the structure so we can be more effective in

conducting our business.

The amateurism committee was touched on slightly by President Burse. It is a very important committee, because it deals with a number of things, not the least of which is the relationship between our eligibility rules and the new procedures that you have read about that will be followed by the United States Olympic Committee. We need to evaluate our eligibility rules, our amateurism rules, as they apply to what is a changing society in amateur sports. That committee also will need a lot of help and guidance. So, you can see with these two committees that the 1990 Convention has the potential of being a very powerful one.

Another issue that is, I know, very paramount in the minds of our athletics directors is the cost of conducting our athletics programs. In intercollegiate athletics, our reaction over the years to solving our financial problems always has been in most cases to define new sources of revenue. We raised our ticket prices. We go to the public to raise more money. We look for new television revenue or corporate sponsors. That is important, and we have to keep on doing these things. But in many cases, we have not followed what is good business practice by instituting cost control on the other side. So while we are dealing with the revenue side, we also are dealing with the expenditure side. In some situations, this has come almost to crisis conditions. Now, we can establish committees and I am sure committees will be established that deal with cost cutting for this Association; but just like so many other things, the real responsibility for meaningful cost containment lies with the individual institutions. It is something that we have to address individually as well as collectively, because many times that cost control does affect the level playing field, about which we all have a great concern.

When we talk about dealing with things on the local level, I think we have to come back to an issue that has been very important and that has been talked about a lot this year—and a lot of things have happened in the last 30 days. The issue is integrity and enforcement. Also a year ago I said, and I have mentioned this many times throughout this year, I personally don't feel that we can legislate integrity. I have given my reasons. Integrity again is an institutional cause, and we will solve that integrity issue when your institutions make a strong commitment to compliance and integrity, and follow through. Only then will we have complete integrity in our intercollegiate programs.

Enforcement is a part of that, and I find that very few people really understand the enforcement process. As established by our constitution and bylaws, the enforcement process should be a cooperative effort between the NCAA staff and the individual institution, going on the assumption that each individual institution wants integrity in its intercollegiate programs. If there are problems, it wants to know about them and wants to solve them. With that process in mind, we should concentrate on compliance and we should be pleased with the enforcement efforts. Now, some major penalties have come down in

the last 30 days, and it is very easy for the news media and even the members to say we really have serious, serious problems in intercollegiate athletics. Things are really going downhill in a hurry. I think it is important that everybody recognize and realize what actually has happened. What you have seen happen in the last 30 days is not what is the state of intercollegiate athletics in January, 1989. What you see is an effort to clean up a lot of cases that have been there for two or three years.

I have talked to our enforcement staff. I have talked to athletics directors, and there is a firm feeling that we have turned the corner when it comes to major violations. We are getting on top of the integrity issue. That is because of programs that you have installed in your own institutions and because of the renewed attitude about having quality and integrity in our intercollegiate programs. You have to join me in making that point. We have to keep emphasizing the positives, because 99 percent of everything that is going on in intercollegiate athletics today is exceptionally positive. We have to be sure that we don't get caught and mired down in that one percent that is negligent. We have to admit our problems, and we have to deal with them. Fortunately, our problems are no different than those we see in society generally. I think we probably do a better job in dealing with our problems than perhaps society does.

Finally, let's not forget what our mission is. Our mission is not to football, not to basketball, not to national championships. Our mission is the education of young people. We are not farm clubs for the NFL and the NBA. At the same time, if we have bona fide students who are also outstanding athletes, we have to provide them the opportunity to develop athletically as well as we do academically. But our real purpose is to prepare people to be major contributors and successful people in society, not to develop great athletics teams. If we keep that in mind, we will be very successful in everything that we do.

The Presidents Commission today, I think, took a major step in addressing an issue that has been out there, the threat of Federal intervention in what we do in intercollegiate athletics. You heard Congressman (Tom) McMillen in Orlando say that if we don't take care of our situation, somebody else is going to do it for us. One of the issues that has been hanging out there for the year is the student's right-to-know act, which, if passed, would require all colleges and universities to provide graduation data on their athletes and their nonathletes by race, by sex, by sport. The Presidents Commission today prepared a statement, which will be announced, stating that they think we should individually make that information available and that they will propose legislation so that the information we gather on an annual basis can be made available to students who are inquiring at individual institutions for admission purposes.

What this all boils down to is we are in a state of change. Your universities are not unlike this Association or any other organization. There is no status quo. We either are moving ahead or falling behind.

We should not fear positive change. We have an opportunity in the next year to put programs in place and to make changes that are very positive. We change the way we do things, change our structure, change our procedures, change our attitudes. We should not be afraid of that. If we work together, I think we can be excited and be pleased with things that will happen in the next few years.

Let me just close with a thought for the day. I have a commercial pilot's license; and I fly, as many of you know. I can attest aerodynamically, and this can be proved through wind tunnel tests, bumblebees can't fly. The size of their body, the shape of their body, compared to their wing span, just will not allow them to fly. But, that old bumblebee is not aware of all of those scientific truths; so he flies anyway and he makes a little honey every day. We have three days coming up when we have an opportunity to do some positive things, to go about our business in a very positive and enthusiastic way. Let's be sure that we do that, and let's make a little honey every day. (Applause)

President Bailey: Thank you very much, Dick, for that excellent report and for the outstanding job that you have done during the past year in this period of change and transition, for the exemplary leadership you are providing for our Association at a time of great ferment in intercollegiate athletics and in higher education, and particularly in helping us so that the Association can achieve more effectively our purposes as stated in the constitution of promoting intercollegiate athletics as an integral part of higher education and the student-athlete as an integral part of the student body.

That concludes our opening business session.

[The meeting was adjourned at 5:35 p.m.]

Presidents Commission National Forum

Monday Morning, January 9, 1989

The NCAA Presidents Commission National Forum was held Monday, January 9, 1989, at the San Francisco Hilton, San Francisco, California, with Chair Martin A. Massengale, Chancellor, University of Nebraska, Lincoln, presiding.

Mr. Massengale: I would like to welcome all of you to this morning's program. This is the fourth and final session in the 18-month Presidents Commission National Forum.

This morning, we will present the initial findings of the massive study on college athletes that has been done, such being a key element in the National Forum during the past 18 months. Following the presentation this morning of the results, we will have a discussion of what this means from a national perspective; and then this afternoon, following the honors luncheon, we will have a third segment that will suggest specific actions, that will look to the future of the NCAA, and you may want to consider the results of this study.

First, let me say that I believe this National Forum has been a very successful service and has encouraged an open exchange of ideas, ideas that relate to crucial topics in athletics across our nation. We have had a number of healthy discussions on a number of issues that are important to athletics and issues that have not always been discussed openly in the past.

Now, we have the initial report of the research about the college athlete that was ordered by the Presidents Commission so that we would have data on which to base our decisions. This study was funded by the NCAA. The study was conducted by the American Institutes for Research, which is now reporting the initial findings, and this will be followed by four additional reports during the next several months.

I want to begin the Forum this morning by presenting representatives of the American Institutes for Research and the Scientific Advisory Committee that it created to oversee this specific research project.

I am going to introduce George Bohrnstedt, who is vice-president of AIR and director of its Palo Alto office, who will introduce the remaining members of the panel and take charge of the program for approximately the next hour and ten minutes.

George W. Bohrnstedt (American Institutes for Research): Thank you, Chancellor Massengale. Thank you to all of you in the

audience who helped to make this study possible. You know, without the assistance of presidents, athletics directors, coaches and, of course, the student-athletes themselves, this research project, the largest and most comprehensive study ever, could never have been conducted.

Now, let me introduce the members of the panel.

Seated to my right is Bob Rossi. Bob Rossi is the study's project director and senior staff man at AIR's Palo Alto office.

To my left is Terry Armstrong. Terry is the project's associate director and also a senior member of AIR's Palo Alto staff.

Seated on the far right is Joan Girus. Joan is a professor of psychology at Princeton University and is one of eight members of the Scientific Advisory Committee that worked with AIR staff on the study right from the design stage to the actual production of the report. Joan has also just completed a term on the NCAA's Academic Requirements Committee and currently is serving as a member of the NCAA's Research Committee.

I am George Bohrnstedt, director of the AIR's Palo Alto office. I also have served as a member of the Scientific Advisory Committee that oversaw this study. One of the reasons that I am here today is because the research to be presented this morning was conducted out of our Palo Alto office.

Our purpose this morning is to review briefly the results of the national study on student-athletes and thereby provide the necessary background for the forum's second and third panels today.

This panel's specific tasks are as follows: Terry Armstrong will review briefly the background and history of the study and also provide an overview of the study's research and design.

Then Bob Rossi, citing results drawn from the study, will provide brief answers to the four sets of questions posed in the Presidents Commission's "Agenda for Reform." After Bob completes his presentation, each of the panel members will take a few minutes to present the results on topics we thought might be of special interest to this audience.

In particular, the topics we are going to address include the recruitment of student-athletes, the issue of freshman eligibility, student-athletes' academic performance, time demands on the student-athletes and the student-athletes' participation in campus life more generally.

Now, here is Terry Armstrong to give you a brief overview of the study background and research done.

Terry R. Armstrong (American Institutes for Research): Some of you may recall that prior to your special June Convention in the summer of 1987 in Dallas, the Presidents Commission issued a policy paper called the "Agenda for Reform." In that paper, the sets of questions the Presidents Commission wanted answered were listed. That was the start of this particular project.

We were invited to prepare a proposal to suggest how those questions might be answered, and we worked with a subcommittee,

with the Ad Hoc Committee on the National Forum, to define that proposal. Not much over a year ago, we started in on this project. It has been a major challenge for us because of the time we had to do it, and it also has been very interesting and rewarding to work with many of you on your campuses.

So, the questions from the Presidents Commission in the "Agenda for Reform" are our starting point. Right after we started in November 1987, just a little over a year ago, we assembled the Scientific Advisory Committee that George already has mentioned.

We also held a workshop here in San Francisco to which we invited constituents, groups of you representing various interests in intercollegiate athletics, to come together with us to help us refine the issues. Some of you in the audience were with us just about a year ago here in San Francisco, in December, where we spent a day and one-half discussing the issues that should be answered by this particular study.

After that, we went back home to Palo Alto, about 30 miles down the road here, and we did a very quick survey of former student-athletes. We contacted more than 100 former student-athletes to help us refine the kinds of things that the student-athletes do during their college careers. All of that was to help us understand better what we were trying to accomplish in this study.

After that, we then designed questionnaires with three separate groups of students: the student-athletes who were participating in intercollegiate athletics, comparison of student-athletes drawn from other kinds of extracurricular activities and a special sample of black students that were neither in intercollegiate athletics nor participating extensively in extracurricular activities.

What we are reporting on today are the first results from that study. We are going to describe what college life is like for the athlete as compared to the other extracurricular students. We do not have comparisons of the typical, the average student. That is not part of our design.

The results we are going to be describing today are based on a national sample drawn from institutions and students at the Division I level. The study was designed to be nationally representative and not to look at smaller units specifically, such as conferences or individual institutions.

The study was designed to gather reports from the athletes themselves, plus information about test scores and about courses taken and about grade-point averages from their transcripts. The study was not designed to gather information from coaches or anyone else about the athletes.

The study was designed to look at intercollegiate athletes at a broad level, providing a national base line to understand the athlete better now. But part of our design also was to provide the basis to look at these young men and women over time, to answer some questions about the life course, about what happens to athletes when they are beyond college and the years out of college.

So we have the capability to keep going back to these young men and women to get more information about their lives. We didn't design the study to look at any particular issues, such as Bylaw 5-1-(j) or freshman eligibility.

We wanted to take a very broad, base-line look at intercollegiate athletics. It was not designed to do an investigation of any kind.

What did we do? We drew a representative sample of 42 Division I institutions, 42 out of the 291. We drew them from conferences within the three subdivisions, so that we could truly, nationally have a representative group of colleges and universities.

Then out of each of those 42, we sampled approximately 100 student-athletes and comparison students.

We went onto the campuses, obtained squad lists of student-athletes and compared similar kinds of lists for extracurricular listings, and from that list sampled at random.

We drew student-athletes from six groups: football, men's basketball, women's basketball, men in other sports who had grants, women in other sports who had grants, and a group of men and women in other sports who did not have grants.

The comparison groups were drawn from extracurricular activities where they had an extensive time commitment, activity such as drama, performing arts, student radio stations, newspapers, student government, or work-study programs.

We made arrangements with the presidents and chancellors of each of these 42 institutions to work with the particular contact person on the campus, and then sent our staff out to the 42 campuses; and that was part of the fun of this project—to get to meet you and to get to be on your campuses.

We controlled the data-collection process completely. We brought the questionnaires onto the campuses, we drew the sample, we made the arrangements for these young men and women to come to rooms that we had arranged, and we were the only people in the room at the time they were filling out the questionnaires for us.

We controlled the quality of these data from the very beginning. We realize (it is) almost once in a lifetime that we get together to put something together like this. So we took special care with the quality of the data.

We did not let these young men and women leave the room until their data collectors had a chance to look through the questionnaires and to make sure that they didn't skip pages. That was just the beginning of our quality-control process.

At each step we double-coded, triple-coded, made very, very sure that we were collecting the best possible data. We assured confidentiality to both the institutions and the students in the study. We will never release the names of any participant in the study.

We also did another small survey this fall that we just have completed, looking at the nonresponses. In any survey of this magnitude, there are always people who for one reason or another decline to participate or that we just couldn't find.

University records, addresses on students, had a lot of variation in them. Many universities don't know where their students live by the spring of the year. We were as persistent as we possibly could be and we were going to weight-training rooms and pulling students out of there, going to dormitories. We would not take no for an answer. Even with our most rigorous procedures, there still were some people who did not participate.

This fall we did a quick survey, going back to the campuses to look at this nonresponse to see what is systematically different from the response. We were very gratified to find they are not, in terms of something like college GPA. The responses are very similar to the nonresponses. We are very confident of this data base.

For our report today, the results we will present today, we controlled the data statistically to represent all college athletes in Division I.

The first report that we are reporting on today is of college athletes in general, controlling for both race and gender, and we are now working on an additional analysis to issue different reports for the black student-athletes and other athletes.

The comparisons that we are describing today are among four groups: all student-athletes as a group, football and basketball players separately, other student-athletes separately, and the comparison students of extracurricular students.

That is just a little bit of the background on how we got the data that we have. We have data now of 4,083 young men and women in our data base. Bob Rossi is going to take a few minutes to describe in general the answers for the Presidents Commission questions that started this study.

Robert J. Rossi (American Institutes for Research): We, in the first report, which is entitled "The 1987-88 National Study of Intercollegiate Athletes," go into great detail looking at the issues, the experiences of the student-athletes on campuses.

I would encourage all of you, if you have not done so, to obtain a copy of these reports. There are actually two of them, one that describes the results and the January report that describes all of the methods. These are available from the NCAA. All you need to do is to write to the NCAA and they will be happy to send you copies.

Because of our time frame, we all are having to be a bit brief. I am going to try to relate to you the four sets of questions that we were instructed to focus on in this work, and I am going to then give you an answer to each of these questions. The answer is a summary of what you will find in the actual report, which is available, as I say, from the NCAA.

The first set of questions from the Presidents Commission, the first question in the "Agenda for Reform," was how do the experiences of the college or university life of student-athletes compare with those of other students who devote a great deal of time to a particular extracurricular activity?

We find that student-athletes and students in extracurricular activities take many of the same types of courses, although their

major fields of study are somewhat different. Student-athletes are more likely to be pursuing degrees, to be expecting their degrees, in business, or business-related fields—approximately 30 percent of these young men and women; and only five or six percent of them are pursuing degrees in physical education.

Student-athletes and extracurricular students spend about the same numbers of hours per week preparing for and attending classes. Both groups say they are satisfied with their academic performance. Student-athletes do spend more time in their sports practicing and competing than extracurricular students spend in their activities; more time, in fact, than they do in season preparing for and attending class combined.

Perhaps as a result of those time demands, the student-athletes miss more classes during the season than extracurricular students do; and they report it is harder for them to make academics their top priority and to get the grades they are capable of.

They also report that it is more difficult for them to take advantage of many of the opportunities for personal growth and development that are typically available during the college years.

For example, they tell us that it is more difficult for them as athletes to learn new abilities and skills, to speak their minds, to get to know other students, to be able to take on leadership responsibility, to take responsibilities for others, to talk about personal problems, and to be liked by others for just being themselves.

The second question posed by the Presidents Commission asked how do the experiences of student-athletes differ depending upon whether one is a participant in big-time sports or in sports that are not given a heavy emphasis?

We find that the experiences of student-athletes in big-time sports accentuate the differences between student-athletes in general and extracurricular students. Football and basketball players spend more time in their sports, receive more full-cost athletics grants, perceive the money they have each month for personal use as less adequate, have more educational resources available to them in the form of teaching assistants and tutors.

However, these resources notwithstanding, they perform less well academically and feel less capable of meeting their academic demands. Football and basketball players, for example, are much more likely than other student-athletes to feel it is harder or much harder to be regarded as serious students by college professors.

Approximately 55 percent of football-basketball players have that perception of the college professors.

Football and basketball players in successfully competitive programs, those that do well against tough opponents, are more likely than other football and basketball players to report having experienced physical and mental abuse, and they are also more likely to report feelings of isolation from other students and feelings that they lack control over their lives.

Although football and basketball players believe that living with

their teammates is a positive arrangement, those who live in such housing with mostly other student-athletes are more likely to report occasional or frequent feelings of isolation in the preliminary assessment of students with multiple problems, those reporting eight or more problems in the areas of psychological distress, physical distress, alcohol, drug abuse, mental or physical abuse, and academic performance.

We find that 12 percent of the football and basketball players in our sample are identified as having multiple problems as compared to only four percent of the other student-athletes.

The third question posed by the Commission asked, and this is a paraphrase, how do student-athletes feel about and evaluate their experiences? Do they see themselves as beneficiaries of fine programs or as exploited?

As I noted earlier, we find that there are no differences, no reliable differences, between student-athletes and extracurricular students in terms of their satisfaction with their educational experience.

About 90 percent of each group is satisfied with their current courses. About 95 percent of each group is satisfied with their college major. About 65 percent of each group is satisfied with their performance in their courses.

In their sports, student-athletes report themselves less satisfied than extracurricular students are in their main activities. Compared to the way that extracurricular students rate the assistance of their activity directors in helping them develop in those activities, student-athletes report that they are less satisfied with the performance of their coaches and the coaching staffs.

Student-athletes do emphasize that it is quite important to them that coaches and coaching staffs assist them in areas outside of athletics. For example, encouraging them to do well in their courses, keeping track of how well they do in their courses, helping them with health problems and listening to their personal problems outside of sports. In these areas, student-athletes rate their coaches very highly.

Now, feelings of exploitation are very difficult to assess reliably in one study. I am sure you can imagine that, particularly a study of college students in their early 20s, late teens, who are probably at the peak time for expecting some good things to come and are in the process of making so many grand plans. For this group, a follow-up study after graduation is certainly called for to address the issue of exploitation.

However, what we can say from the work that we have done is that student-athletes do indeed perceive that it is more difficult for them to be students first and to take advantage of the personal development and growth activities at college because of their participation in intercollegiate athletics.

For some of these students, about a quarter of the football and basketball players and about a third of the participants in other sports, the apparent sacrifices that they are making may be out-

weighed or balanced by their expectation of a professional career in athletics after graduation.

I suspect that we would all agree that after they have graduated they will have perhaps a different perspective on exactly what the sacrifices were and what their value was.

The fourth and final question posed by the Presidents Commission addressed the issue of recruitment, specifically the question how are student-athletes recruited?

What are the differences in test scores and grade-point averages between athletes and other students? How do recruited students personally experience the process of choice of college and university and the role of athletics recruitment in that process?

Now, I am the panelist that will come back in just a moment and talk about recruitment. I will give you the two principal findings now. We find, as you might expect, that student-athletes are recruited more actively and more intensively by colleges and universities than are students who participate in other extracurricular activities.

Football and basketball are the most actively and intensively recruited of all student-athletes. At the same time, student-athletes have slightly lower scores on college entrance examinations, the SAT and the ACT, and their high school grade-point averages are also lower than those of other extracurricular students.

Recruited student-athletes who are grant recipients see that process, the recruitment process, as a time of intense pressure upon them. However, the majority of student-athletes see the recruitment process as helping them to make the right college choice.

Only three percent of the student-athletes that we surveyed said the information they received during recruitment was misleading or in any way caused them personal problems.

These are the briefest of overviews of those four questions; and if you are interested in the full answers not only to those questions but the fuller exposition of all the remarks that you may hear today on the panel, if you do not already have a copy of this first report, I suggest that you obtain one from the NCAA.

As was mentioned, we will be preparing four other reports. There will be a special report on the black student-athlete, a special report on the female student-athlete, and those should be available at the earliest in mid-March.

I hope you will look for those, and I will say in advance that I know there are some of you in the audience, as well as on the panel, whom we will be calling on for ideas and for assistance in the preparation and in the review of those documents. Thank you. (Applause)

Mr. Bohrnstedt: Now, as I indicated earlier, we will each present some results we thought would be of special interest to this group. We are going to call Bob right back up here and have him elaborate on the issues of recruitment and freshman eligibility.

Mr. Rossi: I will start with recruitment and I will mention three points. As measured by the experiences of our sample, the nature of the competition among universities and colleges for superior athletes

has remained relatively constant over the four- to five-year period covered by this national study.

We find no noticeable reductions during this period either in the types of recruitment activities or in the extent to which these activities have caused student-athletes to feel pressured by the recruitment process.

To examine the potential effects of Bylaw 5-1-(j) on recruitment, on the targeting of recruitment strategies in particular, we grouped the freshman and sophomore football and basketball players together with the freshman and sophomore student-athletes in other sports who received grants.

We separate that group into those with composite SAT scores above 700 and below 700. As you know, 700 is the minimum composite score required for eligibility and receipt of an athletics grant.

Under Bylaw 5-1-(j), which took effect the year the sophomores in our study were entering college, what we find is that student-athletes with SAT composite scores below 700 are more likely to have experienced intense recruitment pressure than those in the group with test scores above 700.

Allowing for individual differences in the perceptions of pressure, it would seem that athletics talent rather than regard for 5-1-(j) qualification continues as a driving force behind much of the recruitment activity among Division I institutions.

In spite of the intensity of recruitment, however, as I mentioned, more than 75 percent of football and basketball players and student-athletes who receive grants in other sports report that recruitment helped them make the right college choice.

We examined whether student-athletes who perceive intense pressure during recruitment might be less likely to report that recruitment helped them in making the right college choice. Our analysis indicates that is not the case.

In fact, it is quite the opposite.

Among those student-athletes who say they experienced intense pressure during recruitment, there is actually a slightly greater tendency to report that the recruitment helped them make the right choice.

On the issue of the participation of freshmen in intercollegiate athletics, freshman student-athletes are perhaps most at risk in coping with the time demands and pressures of intercollegiate athletics. For this reason, we looked to see whether freshman student-athletes spend as much time in their sports as other student-athletes and whether they are experiencing any special problems adjusting to these demands.

We began by looking at the relative number of freshmen who compete in intercollegiate athletics at the varsity level as contrasted with those who only practice at that level, the redshirts.

Freshman football and basketball players are less likely to practice and compete with the varsity than are freshman student-athletes in other sports. Forty-two percent of the freshman football

and basketball players practice and compete with the varsity and 42 percent are redshirted.

By comparison, 77 percent of other student-athletes practice and compete. We find no difference in the average number of hours per week freshman redshirts spend in their sport compared to freshman student-athletes who compete, about 25 hours for each group when they are in season.

In season, freshman redshirts and active competitors spend approximately five hours per week less in their sports than do the upperclass participants. In short, freshmen spend almost as many hours in their sports as other student-athletes, whether they are redshirts or players on the roster.

Looking at grade-point averages, we find that overall freshman competitors do about as well academically as freshmen in extracurricular activities, but that freshman redshirts are doing less well than either of those groups.

For the redshirts, the composite GPA was 2.1 and for the other two groups it was about 2.4.

Keeping in mind that the largest percentage of redshirts among freshman athletes on the campus comprise football and basketball players, we also examined GPA differences among these three groups, limiting our attention to football and basketball players among the athletes.

We find that the freshmen football and basketball players, whether they compete or are redshirted, are not reliably different than freshmen in extracurricular activities. When sports are in season, freshman student-athletes who compete in football and basketball report they miss about one-half of a class more per week than do redshirts.

However, we find no substantial differences on other measures—such as course attendance, course performance—between redshirts and freshmen who compete. In addition, freshmen who compete are not reliably different than freshman redshirts in their report of satisfaction with courses, course performance and overall academic performance.

Mr. Bohrnstedt: Now, I am going to ask Joan Girgus if she will talk to us about student-athlete academic performance.

Joan S. Girgus (Princeton University): The academic performance of undergraduates is always of interest because it is seen as reflecting their core educational experience in fairly direct ways. There are any number of ways that one can look at academic performance.

Today, I simply want to touch on a few of those that are included in the study. First, I want to talk a little bit about what the students report as their major fields of study.

This can be an important question, because the choice of major should be based on academic talents and interests and postcollegiate aspirations and not on what is easy or difficult or time-consuming, or hard to schedule.

The differences in this study between student-athletes and extracurricular students in major-field studies are striking. They show quite different patterns. Let me highlight just two of these differences.

First, student-athletes are much more likely to be professionally oriented, particularly toward business, than are extracurricular students.

Second, extracurricular students are much more likely to be majoring in liberal arts and sciences or engineering than are student-athletes. While it is difficult to know at this point what these differences signify, it is worth noting that the pattern for student-athletes is much closer to the general national pattern for undergraduates than is the pattern for extracurricular students.

Some extracurricular students in Division I schools on a national basis may be unusual in their choice of major and this may account for the differences for the student-athletes.

Finally, it is worth noting that the pattern of actual majors follows fairly closely the pattern of intended majors at the time of college entrance for both student-athletes and extracurricular students. This suggests that the choice of major is not much affected by the constraints imposed by being a student-athlete or an extracurricular student.

It would be interesting to follow both the student-athlete and the extracurricular student in these studies to see what the differences are in what they do after college and how their differences relate to what they actually majored in.

We actually know very little about that on a national basis.

The second thing I want to talk about briefly this morning is grade-point averages. The data on grade-point averages show fairly straightforward rank ordering. Football and basketball players who are in more successfully competitive programs have the lowest GPAs.

Second, football and basketball players from less successfully competitive programs and other athletes have rather similar GPAs, and those GPAs fall between football and basketball players in successfully competitive programs, on the one hand, and extracurricular students on the other hand.

Third, extracurricular students have the highest GPAs. The differences in GPAs are not huge, but they are not tiny either; about a quarter of a grade point from football players in more successfully competitive programs to football players in less successfully competitive programs and other student-athletes, and another quarter of a grade to extracurricular students, or about a half grade overall between the football players who are in successfully competitive programs and extracurricular students.

One obvious question at this point is whether these differences in grade-point average are simply continuations of the differences in high school grade-point average and test scores that you already have heard about this morning.

That is, are the college GPA differences a possible group phenomenon, wherefrom the college educational experience simply cannot

overcome preexisting differences in academic preparation, but doesn't add to them either?

It is possible to do statistical tests that control background differences. When these tests are applied to the GPA data in this study, the differences in GPA between the groups are reduced considerably. Nonetheless, football and basketball players continue to have a slightly lower GPA than both athletes and extracurricular students.

It may be important to note that these differences in GPA occurred despite the fact that football and basketball players are more likely to have taken special academic support courses in note-taking and listening in their classes and preparing for assignments and are more likely to have been in basic skills classes in reading, writing and mathematics.

The differences in GPA, while small, persist despite the fact that athletes believe it is easier for them to get academic help from tutors, from teaching assistants, from their academic advisers, and it is easier to get help in choosing their courses and it is easier to get feedback about how well they are doing.

Let me just say one or two words about other academic performance measures. The three other measures in the study that are of interest as other academic performance measures are academic probation, repeating at least one course and receiving at least one incomplete in a course.

On these measures, there are simply no differences among football and basketball players as a group, other athletes and extracurricular students. However, within the group of football and basketball players, those in more successfully competitive programs were more likely to have been on academic probation and to have received incompletes than those that were in less competitive programs.

Now, I want to say a word about students' perception of their academic performance. It is a mixed picture. Given the data on academic performance, it is perhaps not surprising that compared to extracurricular students, student-athletes think it is harder for them to get the grade they are getting or to keep up with their course work; and football and basketball players think it is harder to make academics their top priority or to study for exams.

What is more surprising is that there were no differences between student-athletes, on the one hand, and extracurricular students on the other in the level of satisfaction that they have with their academic performance.

All the students in this study showed a relatively high level of satisfaction with their academic performance.

Presumably, the message in this apparently contradictory set of findings about student-athletes' perceptions of their academic performance is that student-athletes think they are doing as well as they can given the other demands on them, but they do not believe that they are doing as well as they are capable of doing.

What does all this mean? Obviously, we need to be concerned with

the fact that football and basketball players in more successfully competitive programs apparently do less well academically than other student-athletes and with the fact that student-athletes don't think they are working at their full academic potential.

Nonetheless, it is also important to recognize that the differences in academic performance between student-athletes and extracurricular students are fairly small. Differences in academic performance are of interest only to the extent that they signify differences in experience that will have consequences over the longer term.

This study is an important beginning, a beginning base line of data for a longer term. But until we know more about such things as graduation rates, career paths, success in a chosen profession and satisfaction with later life, it will be impossible to evaluate whether the academic performance data that have been gathered so far have any consequences.

I hope it will be possible to follow these students over the years to find out whether the differences found so far continue in the future. This is an important beginning on which to build a more complete picture of the lives of student-athletes. It tells us a good deal we need to know and it tells us even more about what we should be looking at in the future. (Applause)

Mr. Bohrnstedt: I would like to say a few words about time demands on student-athletes.

As Bob mentioned, we found that student-athletes and our comparison group of extracurricular students spend about the same amount of time preparing for and attending classes.

This finding was reassuring for those of us who would have guessed that athletes might spend less time on class activities than the other students.

The picture is more complicated than that. For example, we also found that football and basketball players in season report spending roughly 10 hours more per week on their sport than the extracurricular students spend on their main activities.

Specifically, football and basketball players are spending 30 hours on the sport in season as compared with the extracurricular students who are spending 20 hours on their main activity.

As Bob pointed out, by spending 30 hours per week on this sport, the student-athletes are, in fact, spending more time on the field than they are in the classroom and preparing to be in the classroom. This was not true for the extracurricular students.

To see just how much time being a football or basketball player in a Division I college takes, think of it this way. If one chooses the standard 40-hour work week as a reference, one could argue that in season being a Division I basketball or football player is the equivalent of holding a three-quarter-time job.

As Bob also mentioned, in season the student-athletes report to us that they miss an average of two classes per week compared to one class for the other extracurricular students.

What about the time demands that Bob talked about?

Not surprisingly, out of season the number of hours athletes spend on the sport drops significantly, roughly 12 hours per week. Does the fact that the student-athletes spend less time on their sport out of season lead to an increase in number of hours they spend in preparing for and attending classes?

The answer is yes.

The time the student-athletes spend in classroom-related work increases roughly four hours per week compared to the time spent in these activities in season. We also found that out of season the number of classes missed drops to one per week, the same as for the extracurricular students.

It is worth noting just in passing that even out of season, football and basketball players still report spending a lot of time on their main activity, roughly 18 hours per week.

An important question, of course, is what difference does it make; what effect do these time demands have, if any? Looking at academic performance; we have only begun to do some preliminary analyses. When we considered all of the variables dealing with time, including time spent studying, time spent in class and so on, the one variable, interestingly enough, that appears to be the most important to determine one's grade-point average is the number of classes missed per week.

As we saw earlier, in-season athletes do miss more classes per week than they do out of season. We also saw that they do miss more classes per week than the extracurricular students. The impact of time demands on grades is very important, of course.

I think it is also very important to ask about how the students feel about themselves as a function of the demands associated with being an athlete. As already has been pointed out, I found that one of the most interesting, and disturbing in some ways, finding from this research was that even though athletes spend more time in the sport than extracurricular students spent on their activities, the athletes appear to be getting considerably less joy from their performances than the extracurricular students are getting from their performances.

We also examined whether occupying the role of athletes as opposed to occupying the role of students highly involved in extracurricular activities makes it harder or easier to meet course-work demand.

I simply want to tick off quickly some results that already have been mentioned. What happens, for example, when we compare the results of extracurricular students to the Division I basketball and football athletes?

Football and basketball players are twice as likely to report that they find it harder to get the grades they are capable of attaining. They are nearly three times more likely to report that it is much harder for them to keep up with their course work.

They are also twice as likely to report that it is much harder for them to make academics their top priorities.

They are twice as likely to report that it is harder for them to study

for exams. They also say it is twice as likely to be harder for them to prepare for the classes in general.

So, clearly football and basketball players feel being an athlete makes it much harder for them to reach their potential as students when you compare them with our extracurricular students.

I might point out that the differences just reported are even larger if one focuses on the reports of football and basketball players, and those in more successfully competitive programs as compared to less successful programs.

What have we learned in these analyses? We know that college student-athletes are just as interested in getting a college degree as any other student on campus.

However, we have also learned that involvement in Division I sports, especially football and basketball, takes a lot of time.

Importantly, these time demands appear to have an impact on the athlete's academic performance. These demands may also account for why student-athletes report that it is difficult for them to realize their academic potential.

Finally, we learn that compared to the extracurricular students, student-athletes do not appear to get as much satisfaction from their performance. This occurs in spite of the fact that they spend much more time preparing for the performance than the extracurricular students spend in preparing for theirs. Thank you.

I will ask Terry Armstrong to wrap this up with a short discussion of the athlete's participation.

Mr. Armstrong: Before we open this up for questions from the floor, I want to conclude with a very short description of what the life of a college athlete is like outside his or her sport.

The Presidents Commission asked how the college experiences of student-athletes compare with the college experiences of other extracurricular students and how the experiences of big-time athletes compare with other athletes. You already have heard some of the answers to that question, especially in the areas of recruiting, academic performance and time.

I am going to focus on life outside athletics for a moment. In brief, we find that student-athletes, football and basketball players especially, often are not able to take advantage of the full range of college experiences that are available to students.

They spend much of their free time with other athletes talking about sports. They see others as having greater control over their lives and their actions. They turn to their coaches often for advice about education and career plans. They find it harder to get to know other students on campus, and they feel a greater sense of isolation from other students on campus.

Let me describe some of the findings that support that picture I just gave you. We used an established psychological scale to measure how students attribute the causes for their actions. Student-athletes more often than extracurricular students perceived chance factors and powerful others in their environment as having control over their

actions.

Keeping with that idea, the student-athletes more often than extracurricular students turned to their families, their academic advisers or their coaches for advice about their education and career plans. Football and basketball players especially are more likely to say they are influenced by the college coaches.

In fact, student-athletes are likely to want their coaches to look out for their interests outside of athletics. They are more likely to feel that their coaches should encourage good performance in classes, that they should keep track of how well they are doing in classes.

They think it is particularly important that their coaches pay attention to their problems outside of athletics, and they feel it is important for the coaches to help with their health problems.

We asked all students in our study directly how often they felt isolated from other students on the campus.

Football and basketball players say they experienced greater isolation than other students and athletes in other sports. Further, the football and basketball players in more successfully competitive programs feel even more a sense of isolation.

How might we attribute that feeling? One answer might come from the housing patterns that we looked at. Over 50 percent of all student-athletes report that they live with a roommate who is also a student-athlete. Football and basketball players are more likely to live in university-owned housing that consists of mostly other student-athletes, and they have the student-athlete roommate.

In fact, at 34 of the 42 institutions in our sample, some student-athletes say they are required to live with the student-athlete roommate. That is not necessarily bad. The student-athletes themselves say that living with other student-athletes is a positive arrangement that they rated highly.

The fact is that football and basketball players in more successfully competitive programs who lived with student-athlete roommates feel the greatest sense of isolation from other students on campus.

I just want to list a few other findings that support the picture that I gave you in the beginning.

Student-athletes report that it is harder for them as athletes to assume leadership responsibilities, to learn from their mistakes, to take responsibility for others.

The student-athletes report that it is more difficult for them to develop new abilities and skills.

Football and basketball players report that because they are athletes, it is more difficult for them to exercise self-control or restraint.

Football and basketball players, more so than the extracurricular students, find it hard to achieve and gain personal goals. They find it more difficult to gain the benefits from many social interactions with other students on their campuses.

Many more student-athletes say it is difficult for them to be liked for just being themselves because they are student-athletes. The

student-athletes also report that it is less easy for them to talk to others about personal problems or concerns. When they do talk about the personal problems, it is most likely to be with a teammate.

They report that it is more difficult for them to get to know other students and to speak their minds. It is no surprise that students—all students, including student-athletes—tend to socialize with others who have similar interests.

Football and basketball seems to intensify that.

Football and basketball players spend most of their free time or much of their free time with their teammates and are less likely to spend it with other students who do not participate in intercollegiate athletics.

They are more likely to talk about sports when they are spending their free time with fellow student-athletes. All of these findings support the idea I presented at the beginning; and that is that student-athletes, more so than extracurricular students in our study, find it hard to take full advantage of the experiences that are available to them on college campuses.

Mr. Bohrnstedt: We are available now to field any questions you might have about the study on which we just reported. There are microphones in the aisles. If you have a question, please step up to one of the microphones and feel free to address us.

Lattie F. Coor (University of Vermont): Did you find any differences in the divisions or conferences?

Mr. Rossi: At the moment, we have done no analysis by division or by conference, so the answer at this time is no.

James Fallon (University of California, Irvine): I have only one disappointment with the otherwise fine report. Why didn't you compare the student-athlete, the extracurricular student with the university student, that is, the average college Joe or Jane?

Mr. Rossi: It is a dollar consideration, unfortunately. When we met with the ad hoc committee of the Presidents Commission, we discussed a variety of ways for most efficiently meeting their information needs, to draw sufficient samples to address the four questions that I went through.

We were not in a position to include those individuals not in athletics or extracurricular activities.

What we did do and what we have done and what in the full report we do is to use results from the 1984 Carnegie Foundation National Survey of Undergraduates.

That is a survey that is national and it provides us with an opportunity to make comparisons on a number of items, because during the design of our instruments we actually used items from their survey as well.

So, you will find in the main report we have tried to, if you will, address your concern, and I think it is a good concern, by using these data from another national survey.

From The Floor: I notice you use the term differences, large and small. I would like to know if you ran any hypothesis to find out if

these were significant differences?

Mr. Bohrnstedt: Yes.

From The Floor: What alpha level did you use, 5.01, the pi squares, other variances, or what?

Mr. Bohrnstedt: We assiduously avoided the term "statistical significance" given that we were talking to a general audience. Whenever we talked about differences or reliable differences, we were talking about differences that were statistically significant at the .05 level, taking into account specific weighting requirements given the way we drew the sample and design effects. So we tried to deal with the technical issues, and I think we did.

Richard Dunn (University of Washington): In determining the comparative groups, especially considering the amount of time involved in other sorts of activities, was there any consideration given to students who are employed at least half-time?

Mr. Rossi: What exactly do you mean by "consideration"?

Mr. Dunn: Well, as far as comparison with the student-athlete group, it seems to many of us in the classroom that students have great time constraints upon them who are attempting to work half or more time and go to school full-time at the same time.

Mr. Rossi: Right. Among the extracurricular group, we had included work-study students to an extent; and in the full report, we go into the number of hours spent per week on jobs by students. Those data were asked; and, in fact, the extracurricular group, as I have said, actually included, I am just going to guess, approximately 15 to 20 percent of individuals who indeed had jobs outside.

Gordon Collins (College of Wooster): I would like to ask how comfortable researchers are with the candor on sociodesirability by the students responding in your surveys, any kinds of openness problems that you felt might have existed in those responses?

Mr. Bohrnstedt: No. I think that is an excellent question. The level of cooperation that we got from the president's level down to the athletics directors, coaches and the students themselves was very, very substantial. The response rates we had were very high. I will let Bob talk about that more generally.

One of the things we did, for example, was to ask students if they wanted to comment on an open-ended question at the end; and I think, Bob, it was roughly 45 percent of the students who took the opportunity to write, and in some cases very, very, very extensive responses, and not all of it, as you might guess, was responsive with respect to their experience.

Mr. Rossi: One additional thing, during the pretest, which was conducted at Division I institutions, not in the sample, we actually looked at the question of effect of an interviewer's presence or generally the use of a questionnaire asking items that were sensitive in many cases.

We actually found that students were remarkably frank, both about questions on which there might be a tendency for them to "grandiose" their status or their plan in the hope that an interviewer might feel

more positively inclined toward them, and also on issues that were more sensitive, having to do with abuses, having to do with the recruitment process and what was a part of that process, as they would report.

We found them to be remarkably candid. As George said, all of the data collection was done either by questionnaire or by personal interview in neutral rooms on campuses with only our staff present; and the ratio was usually not greater than four or five students to one of our people.

Mr. Bohrnstedt: One other small piece of evidence with respect to that: We asked the students what their SAT scores were, and then we eventually got their transcripts. For those of you who are statistically minded, the correlation between those was .87, so it was substantial.

Allan Beigel (University of Arizona): I would like to ask two short questions about the different findings of the study. First, you make the point about the relative similarity in the experiences of the student-athlete versus the student who participates actively in extracurricular activities.

Did you make any attempt to look at how the level of services provided to the student-athlete, particularly as they may be differentiated among the different levels of the NCAA, impact on that similarity or lack of similarity in the two sets of experiences?

The second question: You make a point about the relative performance, even adjusted, for football and basketball players in relation to other student-athletes and other students. I wanted to know to what extent you looked at the fall semester, spring semester, summer semester in terms of GPA, the latitude being where the sport activity is less active and there may not be as many differences as stated?

Mr. Rossi: On the services question, so far we have looked at the services available, both to student-athletes and extracurricular students: As we reported, the level of academic resources, educational resources and the like are greater for the student-athletes.

We have, in addition, as I reported, found that they feel it is harder for them and so forth. In terms of the analysis to see if the level of service might affect perception of ability, let's say to take leadership responsibility or to learn new skills, no, we have not done those analyses yet.

In terms of GPA, you are making a very good point.

In our fourth report—I mentioned the report on the black student-athlete, the report on the female student-athlete—and the fourth report is based on the analysis of these transcript data that we have not done yet.

We have the second largest data base of college transcripts that has ever been compiled. It is huge and it contains all of the elements of all of the transcripts, and we will be looking at that kind of question, the difference between the various semesters as well as whether the GPAs that we are reporting this morning, cumulative GPAs, whether the pattern of courses indicates that the substance of courses taken would indeed lead to a degree that is expected.

That kind of thing is not in Report No. 1. It will require time and will be in Report No. 4, probably available in April of this year.

Harold McGee (Jacksonville State University): Why is there only Division I?

Mr. Bohrnstedt: It was actually by design. This is what the Presidents Commission asked us to do. This was not our decision. It was the decision of the Presidents Commission.

Mr. Massengale: I was not involved at the time, but I think it was felt that it was in Division I where the visibility was or the concern has been. That is why the data base should begin there.

I think if there is need or desirability for this to be carried on for other divisions, (that can be considered). Certainly, Division I is the one that has the most visibility and the one that has the greatest concern and perhaps the most pressure on the athletes than in other divisions.

Will you join me in expressing our appreciation to George Bohrnstedt for presenting a very, very fine presentation. (Applause)

We are going to change panels. I will ask the panelists for the second session to come to the podium, please. I think it is now time that we begin the second part, the review of the study from a national perspective.

I think we have had a most interesting session, the first one, in presenting results from the national study. The present panel will take a look at that from a national perspective, and the chair will ask their viewpoints. I know we are all anxious to hear their perspective and what they see of this study.

I feel very fortunate, indeed, that we are able to have four distinguished panelists with us this morning. We are indeed fortunate to have Wil Bailey, who is the current president of the NCAA, and from Auburn University, having served in many posts at that institution.

The second panelist will be Gail Fullerton, who is president of San Jose State University and a member of the Presidents Commission.

Following Dr. Fullerton will be Joe McGuff, who is the long-time sports editor of the Kansas City Star and Times and now vice-president and editor of those famous papers in Kansas City.

Then following Mr. McGuff will be John Ryan, president emeritus of Indiana University and a consultant to this Commission.

Wilford S. Bailey (Auburn University): Thank you, Chancellor Massengale. It is indeed a privilege to join our distinguished colleagues, having the opportunity to make a few observations about the results that you have heard summarized this morning.

Before commenting about the research findings specifically, I think it is important to emphasize again the singular importance of this study and of related research that is being conducted by the NCAA. This project and that related research constitute a major stride in developing information that can only help in forming legislation for the Association and helping achieve our purpose, and to be assured that the principles for the conduct of intercollegiate athletics are truly being implemented with special emphasis on the

more positive
more serious
recruitment
would be
studies
data
information
will provide a resource of tremendous value, not only for immediate use by the Association but also for long-range research by faculty and graduate students at our member institutions.

The second introductory point is to emphasize, I believe, that we must exercise great patience in seeking definitive solutions to the complex and interrelated problems that have been addressed here this morning, problems that we face at the national and institutional levels in our international sports programs and our intercollegiate programs on our campuses.

Like most good research in an area so prevalent with opportunity, perhaps this study raises more questions than it answers. The additional information coming in the four other reports due throughout this spring will help us focus on the basic issues and on alternative ways of addressing these.

We have only an introduction to that, I think, this morning. Even with all that information in hand, some time will be required for careful analysis and productive evaluation of alternative ways of addressing these issues. Considerable debate will be required about the alternative approaches.

I am not suggesting foot-dragging—that would be unthinkable—but we must understand and try to help media representatives and the public understand that there is no quick fix to the complex issues we face. It is far better to be deliberate and thoughtful and to construct and use to the greatest benefit possible the most effective communication network among the constituencies of the Association as we proceed with that debate and strive for appropriate actions for true reform, not mere patchwork.

My third point is this. As we study these data and those to follow, the most fundamental concern guiding our course of action is the necessity of achieving and maintaining a wholeness, a true wholeness in the relationship of intercollegiate athletics and education in our institutions.

I remind you that notwithstanding widespread use otherwise, the fundamental meaning of integrity is wholeness.

We have for too long permitted in far too many institutions varying degrees of fracture of that essential relationship.

With respect to the results of this first report, I view with considerable satisfaction the many evidences of close comparability of the expectations and the experiences of student-athletes and the nonathlete students who devote considerable amounts of time to extracurricular activities.

It is not necessary to dwell on those similarities.

the welfare of the student-athlete.

The Association is at the midpoint of a 10-year study of academic preparation and performance of student-athletes on I and that that study has now been completed on II. All of this is being done internally by our very capable NCAA Research Committee.

The study will provide a resource of tremendous value, not only for immediate use by the Association but also for long-range research by faculty and graduate students at our member institutions.

I think they have been adequately addressed thus far this morning, at least for this stage in the reporting of the results of the study.

There are clearly some danger signals. One of those danger signals is the evidence that there is a divergence in the degree of comparability of student-athletes in football and basketball and those in other sports, and the divergence would appear due to a variety of factors related to the greater pressures to win in those highly visible sports.

Some of the danger signals are stronger in the comparisons of experiences of those student-athletes in football and basketball in institutions with the greater success in competition in recent years as measured by win-loss records.

We should not conclude that participation in these more visible sports inevitably must result in that undesirable imbalance between education and athletics. Certainly, we must not conclude that the mastery necessary for winning cannot be an important element of education for life.

We must, however, be assiduous in our efforts to maintain that wholeness and balance of education and sports so essential to assure that the great values of both can be achieved during those years that are so important for preparation for life and for living.

Stated differently, I believe that we cannot permit the demands on student-athletes necessary to achieve the highest order of athletics excellence in any sport to preclude an adequate level of preparation in the pursuit of a meaningful education. I think that is the essence of what we are addressing.

For me, the most striking and clearly dangerous signal of the research set forth in the first report is the indication that so much pressure is being placed on student-athletes, especially in football and basketball, and particularly in the competitive and successful programs, that many of the students, even though they indicate they are satisfied with their academic performance, acknowledge that at the same time they are unable to achieve their expected or potential level of performance academically.

There is strong evidence, I believe, that the demands are so great, and not merely in the season of competition, that the students are so drained physically and emotionally that they cannot be adequately productive in their preparation for and participation in the classroom and the laboratory.

The amount of time spent in practice and competition is not the only consideration. The physical, emotional and mental state of the student-athletes with respect to their abilities to function effectively as students in study and class performance after practice and competition must be a concern.

Finding the best way to ameliorate this problem will not be easy. It will require our best efforts and a spirit of cooperation. I believe we must initiate immediately on our individual campuses and in the Association discussion and debate; we must undertake that effort and we must pursue it diligently.

Finally, there are several points in the report that on first blush

project considerable concern about which we, I feel, must not be hasty in jumping to conclusions.

Examples include, first, the perception of many of the student-athletes that intense recruiting pressures helped them in making the right choice of an institution.

Without knowing more about the criteria for what determined whether the institution chosen was indeed the right choice, it is very hard to place confidence in this reported perception and not to question the potential negative effects of the admitted intense recruiting pressure.

Second, it is not surprising that football and basketball players feel they are receiving inadequate financial aid and should have more when they hear this constantly from many coaches and the media and general public.

I am convinced that this is an area in which we have not done an adequate job as an Association and in our institutions in communicating the facts about financial aid.

We have a lot of myths that differ with the facts about financial aid. We need to do a better job in communicating those facts to student-athletes, to the media representatives and to the public generally.

Third, until we know more about what was judged to be mental abuse, we should be careful about blaming coaches or other extracurricular activity supervisors. I am quite confident that a considerable number of my students at the time they were in this class in the laboratory would have thought me guilty of mental abuse, a judgment that was not maintained in later years.

Mental abuse, and possibly even physical abuse, may at times be in the eye of the beholder unless there are specific criteria for arriving at that judgment.

I am not saying there is not a problem here; rather, we need to be careful about jumping to conclusions that may not be warranted until more information is available. Thank you very much. (Applause)

Gail Fullerton (San Jose State University): I have found this a fascinating study to peruse. I have had the copies for perhaps two or three weeks. I read in a national news magazine recently that according to that editor they thought it was too bad that Senator Proxmire retired before giving one of his Golden Fleece Awards to the NCAA, because he may have had some notion of what it cost.

Someone asked a while ago why we didn't take Divisions II and III as well. At this point, when we first saw what it would cost to do all three divisions, we gulped hard and said, "Let's start with Division I."

Anyway, according to that editorial writer, the NCAA spent a lot of money to find out that football players get lower grades than other students. It was a short little piece. One or two of my colleagues here have expressed similar sentiments.

But it was not the purpose of the National Study of Intercollegiate Athletes to find something startling and controversial that would sell well on the news racks. I do think that the differences found in many

points are relatively small. I was struck more with the similarity of experience than the divergence.

The purpose of the study was to provide the NCAA, and that means all of us collectively, with reliable information on which we can base decisions on legislation that is intended to improve the college experience of our student-athletes.

Absent such base-line data, we have had to rely on anecdotes, sometimes on horror stories, but without knowing whether people in situations depicted represent the larger reality of intercollegiate athletics. These data will provide us with touchstones against which we can examine prevailing stereotypes and the conventional wisdom regarding athletes.

The stereotype that football and basketball players are not as good students as others did receive some modest support. The study found that student-athletes had lower ACT and SAT test scores and lower high school grade averages than the comparison group of students.

The differences were not all significant. On the average, football and basketball players had a B average coming out of high school and about a quarter of a grade lower than the high school grades reported by those participating in other sports and extracurricular activities.

The collegiate grade-point averages taken from university records, not specifically reported, show also that the football and basketball players did have slightly lower grade-point averages, 2.460 GPA overall for football and basketball players as compared to 2.610 GPA for athletes participating in other sports, and 2.790 for students involved in other curricular activities.

Let it be noted that these differences are between a solid C average for the football and basketball players and a C+ for the comparison groups, hardly a large enough difference to support the stereotype of the illiterate athlete, individual horror stories to the contrary notwithstanding.

When you look at the questionnaire in the back of the book, you will understand that you have to be literate to fill out the questionnaire, and most of the athletes, some 4,000 in all, seem to have filled them out completely.

Given the other findings of the study, the football and basketball players entered college less well-prepared than the comparison groups, as the ACT and the SAT scores would indicate; and during the season of competition for their sport, football and basketball players missed two classes per week on the average. So the impact on grade averages is perhaps understandable.

You already have heard a lot about the number of hours of the week. I am not going to go back over that. When you look at the number of hours spent in class and in preparation for class and in their activities, the demands on, say, the staff of the student newspaper, the student role in the current music or drama production when they are in season, so to speak, they are really roughly comparable.

There were some points of the conventional wisdom not borne out

by the study, and one of these is the assumption that all athletes are physical ed majors. I don't know why that is often said, and the tone that it comes in. The study found that only about 5.5 percent of football and basketball players were physical ed majors, and only a slightly larger proportion of other student-athletes, 7.1 percent, were physical ed majors.

Conversely, 93 to 97 percent of the student-athletes were majoring in a discipline other than physical education. I don't know where the coaches are going to come from in the future. The most common major pursuit for student-athletes in the comparison of students was business.

Although a higher proportion of athletes than others chose business, for all the students interviewed, business was the most frequently chosen major. That is not news to us. The highest number of choices are made in business and professional careers.

The stereotype of the athlete is, however, similarly not that of the management, marketing or accounting major. When you say athlete, you don't think of accountants.

About one in three of the student-athletes were business majors. Perhaps that accounts for the fact that corporations talk about having a game plan and being a team player.

The second most frequently chosen major for student-athletes, including football and basketball players, was social sciences. The most commonly chosen majors in sliding order were business, social sciences, various professional occupations, communications, engineering and then physical education.

Students involved in other extracurricular activities did choose majors in the arts and humanities significantly more often than did the student-athletes, but that is not too surprising considering that the sample was drawn to include students participating in the theater, dance, on the newspaper and in various performing arts.

The study documents many similarities between student-athletes and the comparison group; and it suggests that the college experiences of the student-athletes are not that substantially different from the college experiences of the students involved in the university theater or the campus newspaper, or the marching band or student government.

However, there are indications of dissimilar family backgrounds of the student-athletes in the comparison list of students. The data reported a significant difference between football and basketball players and the comparable students in the amount of money they reported available for personal expenses, such as food, clothing, transportation, medical care not related to athletics injuries, dental care and socializing.

Football and basketball players reported significantly less money available for such expenses than did the comparison student groups. There were socioeconomic data collected but not included in this first report, and it might be interesting to see whether there is a difference in the family background of those participating in things like golf,

tennis and swimming than the football and basketball players.

In any event, the amounts reported averaged \$82 per month for football and basketball players for clothing, for incidental personal expenses, transportation and so on. That compared to about \$100 per month reported by athletes competing in other sports and \$114 per month for students involved in other extracurricular activities.

We asked if the amount they had available was adequate for their needs, and a significantly greater percentage of the football and basketball players said no.

As noted already, football and basketball players apparently come less well-prepared for college from high school experiences. Together with the information regarding financial support, it is suggested that student-athletes who are in football and basketball programs come from disadvantaged family backgrounds more frequently than do athletes competing in other sports.

A common criticism of the intercollegiate athlete is that poor athletes are encouraged in unrealistic expectations for the professional sports career. It is interesting, but I have never heard a university criticized for encouraging its students in the performing arts in their dream to become professional actors, professional dancers, artists or musicians.

The student-athletes were asked whether they expected to become professional athletes. Twenty-three percent of the football and basketball players, and 30 percent of the recipients in other sports, 15 percent are nongrant holders in other sports, said they expected to become professional athletes when they enrolled in college and most of them still had that expectation when they were interviewed.

Of the seniors, 21 percent of the football and basketball players and 25 percent of the grant recipients in other sports say they expected to become professional athletes when they enrolled and still had that expectation at the time of the survey.

However, when the 21 percent of senior football or basketball players who cherish the hope of becoming a professional athlete were asked to estimate their chances for realizing that dream, only eight percent of the 21 percent, according to the study, and by my calculation that would be about two athletes in 100, reported that they almost certainly will become professional athletes.

Such hopes may be realistic, in fact—these were senior football and basketball players of the Division I schools—given the size of the draft and the number of free agents hired each year. It would have been interesting to compare the career expectations of the student-athletes to those of the comparison group of students participating in music, drama, journalism and student government.

Unfortunately, the question about expectations of becoming a professional athlete did not have a counterpart question concerning the dreams of becoming a professional actor or a dancer. On the questionnaire used for the comparison group, that was one of the few things I found lacking in this very fine study.

Sports, music and theater have, first, avenues of upward mobility

for many of the groups in America. After opening doors for their talented athletes and artists, I will grant that disadvantaged groups have then gone on to achieve in other areas of society.

The history of sports such as baseball and boxing also has mirrored the possibility of these groups in this country, first the Irish, Italians, Blacks, Hispanics, and similarly the history of music and theater is a study of upward mobility of immigrants, ethnic groups.

It is as common for young men and women from disadvantaged subcultures to dream of being a star as a way up from poverty as it is for other Americans to dream of becoming a millionaire through more conventional avenues. However, the study indicated that the overwhelming majority of student-athletes also has as a goal completing their college degree.

I look forward to later reports drawn from this rich lode of data and to the longitudinal study that may come from it. I hope we will use this as a data base in making informed decisions now and in the future. (Applause)

Joe McGuff (The Kansas City Star and Times): In late April in the election campaign, the public was introduced to this fine doctor. George Bush, in his debates with Mike Dukakis, said not to worry, the good doctor would call the members of the media to the side and explain what the candidate really meant to say.

No problem is too big or too small for these doctor fix-its. A good spin doctor can take any set of facts and figures and turn them to the advantage of his candidate.

As you might assume, this brings us to the subject we are discussing today, the proper role of intercollegiate athletics in higher education and the spin that each one of us wants to put on the study by the American Institutes for Research.

The spin put on this study by some in the college community has been quite favorable. Martin Massengale, chancellor of the University of Nebraska, was quoted as saying, "It is reassuring to find student-athletes so near others in the student body."

Chuck Neinas, executive director of the College Football Association, makes the point that the image of college athletics is catching up with its progress and adds, "I would like to believe that the findings of the NCAA-sponsored study confirm that point."

The press has tended to put a different spin on the report. Bob Verdi of the Chicago Tribune wrote, "It is mind-boggling that the NCAA is spending \$1.3 million on this study," and he adds, "One would think the NCAA has been around too long to be so naive. We should never underestimate the ability of this organization to outdumb itself." (Laughter)

Furman Bisher with The Atlanta Journal noted that college football and basketball players spend more time on their sports than they do in the classroom, that they make lower grades and that fewer graduate in comparison with the rest of the student body. "Big news," Bisher wrote. "That is like saying roosters crow, pigs oink and babies cry." Bisher also observes, "There is no reason to look for change until

the prime-time athletes form a union."

Unlike some of my colleagues, I do see benefits in this study. It didn't tell me anything that surprised me, but the Presidents Commission has to have some facts and figures if it is going to make proper decisions on the role of athletics within the college educational system.

I see the study as a starting point, but I will offer this warning. If the spin that the presidents choose to put on this is to say, "My, look how good things are," then instead of a starting point it will be a dead end. The problem with trying to analyze and interpret this study is that all of us, coaches, administrators, the media, have preconceived ideas about the proper role of athletics in higher education, and we will tend to bend the facts to our way of thinking.

I know I have a bias to this study, as one who has been covering intercollegiate athletics at all levels over a period of 38 years. I enjoy college athletics. I have made many wonderful friends through the years among administrators, coaches and athletes.

I think the personal benefits of athletics are enormous. I also must say that the concept of big-time college football and basketball as amateur sports is pure fiction. The concept of the student-athlete does not correspond with reality.

To me, the facts and figures of this study proved what I already knew, to-wit: that these young men are athlete-students. The study shows in football season and basketball, players spend 30 hours a week on their sports, they spend 13.7 hours in the classroom and 11.6 hours preparing for class, a total of 4.7 hours less than they spend on sports.

Even out of season, they spend more time in their sports than they do in class, 17.9 hours compared to 14.4.

Student-athletes miss about two classes a week when their sports are in season, while the extracurricular group missed 1.2.

The study shows that football and basketball players score lower on ACT and SAT tests and have lower high school grade-point averages than do athletes involved in other sports and those involved in extracurricular pursuits.

Football and basketball players in big-time programs are more likely to have academic problems than other students. 42.8 attend summer sessions as opposed to 27.9 in smaller programs. We have no figures for the extracurricular group. 41 percent have repeated one or more courses, and 34 percent have been on academic probation, and 23.5 percent have received an incomplete at least once.

Twenty-two percent of the football and basketball players feel it is much harder to keep up with course work as opposed to eight percent of the extracurricular students.

About 12 percent of the football and basketball players and 14 percent in the big-time programs had personal problems, psychological, physical, mental and physical abuse, academics.

In other sports, it was four percent.

For the extracurricular students, it was seven percent. Twenty-five

percent of the injured football and basketball players said they felt intense pressure to ignore their injuries. Student-athletes feel a greater sense of isolation, and those who live in student housing with other athletes especially feel this way in comparison with those who live in housing with other kinds of students. Student-athletes on the average have less spending money than the extracurricular students.

Certainly, there are some encouraging things to be found in the study, but the picture that emerges is one of the big-time football or basketball player who is less gifted academically, who comes from poor circumstances, devotes more time to sports than to academic pursuits, has substantially more academic problems and more problems living up to his or her academic potential, feels more isolated and has more mental, physical and personal problems than those in other sports and the extracurricular pursuits.

In a college or university, everything should be subordinated to education. I don't think anyone can look at the facts and figures presented in this study and say that is the case. On a theoretical plane, there is no justification for educational institutions to be running sports to produce millions of dollars of income and not give players something of substantial value to perform.

But I am not naive enough to think that radical changes can be made in big-time college athletics. There is too big a structure in place, too much money at stake and too much alumni support of the present system. But if we are stuck with this system, then let's take steps to make sure that in the future football and basketball, as well as all other sports, clearly are subordinated to academic pursuits.

In closing, let me make this point. On Wall Street, in the defense industry, in the Olympics and in college athletics, as the financial stakes rise so does the pressure to cheat become greater. The size of the enforcement staff, the size of the rule book, the severity of the penalties keeps going up in college athletics in proportion to the size of the financial stakes.

Those who think that tough enforcement in sports of a severely flawed system is a final answer are going to be disappointed. In this respect, it reminds me a little bit of the story of the farmer who was driving down the road and saw a man in the ditch. He was driving a big Cadillac, and the farmer stopped and thought he would offer him some help.

He said, "Sir, can I be of assistance?" He noticed that the man was standing in front of the car and the man said, "No, I can take care of this myself." The farmer noticed that he had a little dog in a harness, and the dog was tied up to the front end of the Cadillac.

The farmer said, "Sir, I don't mean to interfere but that little dog can't pull that car out of the ditch." The man looked at him and he said, "Oh, that's all right. I've got a whip." (Laughter)

John W. Ryan (Indiana University): I notice that our common theme for members of this panel is to consider or to review the study from a national perspective. Noticing that I was last in the group, I decided I had better have something to say besides presenting to you

again facts and figures that others have already done for me and done better than I could have anyway.

So I would like to ask you to think of the national perspective of these data and this study in a slightly different way.

First, I want to commend all of us as the heart and soul of the NCAA, which this Convention is, for supporting the Presidents Commission initiative to undertake a study seeking objective and systematic information where we have had anecdotal experience and suspicion before.

I want to remind us all that we sit here in this session and the sessions that will follow influenced and guided by the past—that is all we know—and propelled by challenges we recognize in the future. If we stop there, this is my point, this will be not only a successful, but a very important NCAA Convention and it will be very rewarding to each of us because as we function in this capacity this week our eyes ought to be on the future, hoping that those who sit here some years from now will have for their past a better and different one than we have for ourselves.

This study presents a national perspective for all of us and all involved in intercollegiate athletics, because it represents at least two reinvigorated activities for NCAA that can make a difference.

One, the study is evidence of a commitment on your part to know, not to guess, hypothesize, but to know. For me, the compelling national perspective for this study is that it will continue, this research initiative, in whatever form, will continue because we need the continued commitment to know what the facts are so that we can act on them, not spin them—that was good advice—and not hide them, to know the facts.

But, secondly, let's not kid ourselves. All of us are professors, administrators in colleges and universities whose basic commitment is to know and act on the basis of what we know. The NCAA, then, will function more consonant with the values of the very people we live with all year, because of this initiative.

The second initiative, the second national perspective, is to prepare members of the media who start out as our own students; to prepare members of the boards of trustees, who start out as our own students; to prepare presidents, chancellors, administrators, to prepare them by a systematically organized program of workshops and seminars or publications, again all the kinds of things that you and I and those we live with every day throughout the year do in our colleges and universities to prepare themselves for knowing the facts, drawing conclusions, taking actions, evaluating problems on the basis of what we know.

The third national perspective that is important to me is so simple perhaps I should not even say it; but the study says, among other things, that athletes want to be students. A year ago, not very many would have stood up and said that even if they believed it. But athletes are not prepared or as prepared as they must be to be students. That provides the NCAA and every member with an agenda of trying to do

something about that.

Another national perspective in which to view this study and its results is that, as earlier speakers on this panel and the preceding panel have stated very clearly, the problems are very real. We knew that, but now we know it with more precision, and they are important.

But, in my opinion, the study gives us reason to conclude they are trackable, they are manageable. The students themselves, and I think not much has been made of this to this point, the students themselves who participated in this survey thought it was the right thing to do, appreciated the initiative that the questions even were being asked, believed the right questions were being asked of them and felt some measure of optimism that this initiative would lead to a better environment for dealing with the problems that the study itself verified and/or clarified.

Next, the national perspective is that which we can't know this morning, but we can anticipate because of the follow-up studies of black athletes compared with comparison students, women athletes compared with comparison students, and an opportunity, not until now available, for longitudinal study of the very population of those students participating up to this point.

What does that mean? That means some questions we find important now that we can't answer can be answered if we will continue this initiative, if we will carry forward the momentum that has been created. May I say that momentum itself is a national perspective in which to see this study.

The momentum of the study—its primary place in this forum, the attention you pay to it by your attendance here this morning—this momentum says that, all who care, want to address the fundamental and major problems of intercollegiate athletics, which in my view are rooted in the fundamental nature of American society itself.

Since we want to deal with these fundamental problems this way, let us know as objectively and systematically as we can all there is to know. Let us act connecting the proposals we make for action to the factual base that we know. Let us evaluate and thus let us grow. Let us progress.

Let me conclude with another national perspective that is my idea, and maybe no one else will share it.

Reference has been made directly and indirectly, and it is implicit in aspects of the study, to what is now known as Bylaw 14.3, what it is, what effect it is having and so on. I think that is entirely appropriate.

But let us put that element of the study into a national perspective. What we do, what we want to do in order to positively affect outcomes with our action, and what we are, links in intercollegiate athletics and the institutional framework within which intercollegiate athletics exists with the secondary educational systems throughout the country.

If we are not prudent, careful, thoughtful, we can take actions thought by us perhaps correctly to be the right ones that can be

damaging or difficult or problematic for that same secondary school system that produces our students.

If we are prudent, we can take actions good for intercollegiate athletics, good for higher education, good for the secondary school system of the United States; and we owe it to our colleagues in academics and in athletics activities at the secondary level to be as careful as we can to communicate, to coordinate and all of us to attempt to reach that better future that will be the past for those who follow us. (Applause)

Mr. Massengale: I wonder if you would like to ask some questions of any members of this panel.

Kenneth J. Weller (Central College, Iowa): I do not have a question, but I have a comment related to the national perspective. I make it on behalf of a rather invisible group that represents about two-thirds of the members in this audience.

We have spent a great amount of money to make sure that this study is accurate, valid and scrupulously objective.

The results are impressive. Nonetheless, I would like to point out that these data do not reflect accurately the total situation of the institutions of the NCAA.

It is important that the membership and the public, as informed by the press, realize that the data are limited to a narrow, troubled segment of about one-third of our members and less than half of the student-athletes, those in Division I.

If all the colleges had been included, the revealed areas of strength would have been much stronger and the revealed weaknesses significantly ameliorated. This may be rather obvious to those familiar with the Association, but what is obvious doesn't get communicated. It doesn't produce attention-grabbing headlines or capture the interest. But it is a crucial and integral part of the story that must be told.

At a previous Forum, one of the speakers suggested the value of an institution is a function of its contribution to the revenues of this Association. Yesterday, Dick Schultz, in the moving conclusion to his address, reminded us that it is rather a function of what we do as educators in encouraging the lives of young people.

If that is the case, then it should be noted that despite their limited revenue production, these other, invisible colleges contribute a great deal. It is not reflected in these data. The overall performance of the institutions of the NCAA almost certainly is much better than this study reveals. I wish we could spend the money to prove it to ourselves and to the public. Thank you. (Applause)

Mr. Massengale: We appreciate those comments, Ken, and also your bringing it to the attention of the members of the Association. I, too, hope that somehow in time we might include a much broader group of our student-athletes.

Monday Afternoon, January 9, 1989

The meeting was called to order at 3 p.m., with Chair Martin A. Massengale, chancellor, University of Nebraska, Lincoln, presiding.

Mr. Massengale: This is the third and last session of the Forum for this Convention. It seems to me that after that very impressive honors luncheon it should be cause for all of us to reflect on what college athletics is all about in our country and in our society today. Perhaps it can provide an excellent springboard for our discussions this afternoon.

We are indeed fortunate to have a number of distinguished panelists who will present from their standpoints the implementation or possible action that we may take on the AIR study, which we heard about this morning.

First will be Cedric Dempsey, who is director of athletics at the University of Arizona at Tucson.

Next will be Edward Fort, who is chancellor of North Carolina A&T State University, and then Christine Grant, who is director of women's athletics at the University of Iowa.

Then we will hear from Jackie Joyner-Kersey, who is the woman athlete of the year, called one of the outstanding ones of our time, and then Jeffrey Orleans, followed by Charles B. Reed, chancellor of the State University System of Florida.

Then our former chair of the Commission, John Slaughter, who is now president of Occidental College, formerly at the University of Maryland, College Park, who will share with us his perspective.

I think without further ado from me at this time, I would like to introduce to you Cedric Dempsey, who is the director of athletics at the University of Arizona, to lead off the afternoon panel.

Cedric W. Dempsey (University of Arizona): Thank you, Chancellor Massengale. I am pleased to be able to lead off the afternoon session because after the morning session, I have restructured my comments three times. If I sat up here during the rest of the comments, I am afraid I might try to restructure it again.

Obviously, we have been given a short period of time to comment, and one of the hardest tasks is to try to condense your thoughts into less than 10 minutes on this subject. However, with the skills I learned in time management as a student-athlete, I am sure I will be able to accomplish that task. (Laughter)

The luncheon, as always, is a very uplifting experience, and I think it is very appropriate that this afternoon we are addressing and having an opportunity to discuss some of the issues at hand from the report that was presented this morning.

Obviously, we saw the creme de la creme of intercollegiate athletics today; and as I was sitting there today, I wondered, why are we up here discussing this issue? I am sure we all came out of there with an uplift feeling and outstanding feelings about intercollegiate athletics.

Nevertheless, there are issues to address; and before I get into three areas, I would like to make some observations about the report and

also about some of the comments that were made this morning.

I think it is very important when we look at this study to keep in mind that it is a descriptive study and is not a cause-and-effect study. Too frequently in descriptive studies, we have a tendency to try to draw a cause-and-effect relation from them. I think it is very important that we keep this in mind in trying to interpret the findings that were presented this morning.

I do not particularly find too many of the findings of this descriptive data to be surprising. There were some, and I would like to comment on those. I think the other point that I would like to mention up front is that we should keep in mind that the study is based upon what the student-athlete thinks about himself or herself and what they perceive the situation to be; and it is not necessarily what is real. If you don't believe there is a difference, then ask me sometime how good an athlete I was in college.

Also, I appreciated President Weller's comments this morning. Our relationship goes back a long way, having in my own experience started at a Division III institution. I do think it is very important that we keep in mind what is the philosophy of Division I, particularly in its relationship to Division III.

If you have not reread that recently, if you will look in your proposed new Manual, I will draw your attention to page 263 of that Manual, because it points out really the basic principles of Division I intercollegiate athletics.

Because of some of my following comments, I would just like to state those to you at this time; because I think it has a very important meaning to me as I try to look forward to what are the implications of the study that we are discussing.

No. 1 is that Division I intercollegiate athletics is based upon the pursuit of excellence at the highest levels.

No. 2, that the dual role of athletics of serving both the university or college community and the general public, that is the basic difference, it seems to me, from Division I to Division III. If you read Division III, I think you will agree with me on that.

No. 3, that we sponsor one or both, football and basketball, at the very highest level of excellence.

No. 4, that, financially, athletics programs at the Division I level should attempt to support themselves from revenues they are generating.

Those are statements that are restated from the philosophy of Division I intercollegiate athletics, and I think it is important to keep that in mind. Sometimes, I feel like we ought to be up here discussing our philosophy rather than the pragmatic solutions that we try to achieve through our legislative processes.

There are three areas I want to comment on from the study. One is time demands. I am not too surprised at the time demands on athletes. I would like to have seen a breakdown, as I did with the academic area, of the time spent in actual practice versus meeting times, weight-training times, film-watching times, and medical and

training preparation.

I think it would have been very interesting to see how much time we actually are spending there. I am surprised at the out-of-season time spent in other sports. Since there is no out-of-season in the Sun Belt area, it seems to me that for most of the sports, I suspect you are looking at 20 hours a week in those areas other than football and basketball.

I know that at the University of Arizona there is no out-of-season. The out-of-season is the month of December in the spring sports. It is not fall and spring, and I think we need to be cautious as we look at these data to keep in mind that other sports outside of football and basketball, which have regulated their seasons, today at the Division I level, most of them are working out seven, eight, nine months a year.

I am surprised at the number of classes that are missed. Our own studies at the university would indicate that other sports miss considerably more time than football and basketball. We have completed that study in the last year.

The Pac-10 has looked at that approach; and in almost every indication, sports other than football and basketball miss considerably more class time than the ones that were pointed out in this particular study.

I also would point out, and I am not sure this is a positive or a negative, but I would also point out there is no relationship between the amount of class time missed and GPAs of student-athletes at the University of Arizona. In fact, there is almost an inverse relationship.

We looked at our various sports. Those sports that missed the most class time did the best academically to some degree. I am talking about many of our spring sports. I think you need to be cautious about that and it may say something more about the student-athlete who enters certain sports than it does say about their classroom time that they are spending.

The Pac-10 has been studying the time-demand issue and this past year polled a sampling of seniors in football and asked a couple of questions relating to legislation that is appearing before us this week.

One, what do you think of spring practice? You think of what your answer to that would be. It was unanimous by the football players who are graduating that we should continue spring practice. It was also by an overwhelming majority that we should continue to allow contact in the spring.

Football players felt it was the one time they had for development of their skills, an opportunity to prove they could move into a first- or second-team situation; and they strongly supported the concept of spring football.

A second issue: Would you favor playing 12 games? Again, it was almost unanimous against 12 games. Keep in mind that this was a relatively small sample; but I think it does give us encouragement and is particularly related to what Executive Director Schultz said yesterday, we need to confer with our student-athletes regarding their opinions more. They did feel we should look at shortening the

season in football even to the point of eliminating byes, although there was some controversy on that, and certainly not going past the Thanksgiving weekend to participate.

I would be opposed to national legislation attempting to deal with the time-demand issue. I support the philosophy of the pursuit of excellence at the Division I level; and to tell Jackie Joyner-Kersey she would be restricted in her dedication to pursue excellence and become the best in her chosen pursuit is contradictory, it seems to me, to that philosophy.

Frankly, I feel that trying to control such legislation would be a management nightmare. Each of us probably would have to go out and get a time clock and attempt to determine the time demands of the student and what we might be able to do.

In my mind, even though it was said this morning, the study also did not indicate to me that student-athletes spent any more time academically when that time was available out of season than in season. I had not seen the full report until this morning; but it seems to me that when they have free time, it is used more in the social area than it is in the academic area.

So, I, therefore, question the value of restricting one goal of the pursuit of excellence in a chosen area versus the broad concept of education. That is not a value judgment. I think they both have a place in higher education.

Also, I feel that we are addressing this issue by increasing initial- and continuing-eligibility requirements.

If a student-athlete is unable to pursue excellence on both fronts, we have satisfactory ways of limiting participation. I see no reason to limit the athlete who can handle both experiences.

The second observation regarding the study that I would like to make: It seems to me that the study indicated that a majority of the football and basketball athletes feel that they do not have enough money per month after basic expenses.

This may be related to some socioeconomic factors as it relates to other groups; but nevertheless, it is an issue that we need to address. When we consider approximately 50 percent of our student-athletes have financial difficulty in living on a month-to-month basis, it seems to me that we need to seek ways to assist them.

This problem, however, is compounded by the financial difficulties most of us face in funding intercollegiate athletics, as well as the philosophical consideration in distinguishing the difference between sports and such opportunities.

I find no solution that I am totally comfortable with, but I would present three possible directions that we need to study further.

One is to reduce the number of sports required to participate in Division I. This would allow shifting of funds to increase financial aid to those student-athletes in the sports retained. Most institutions have been forced into similar decisions in other areas.

This would possibly permit institutions to offer whatever sports they decide at the highest level rather than inconsistent performance

or inconsistent philosophies that we see exist at many institutions today where they offer football and basketball and token representation in other sports.

This is basically in conflict with the Division I philosophy, and I have a hard time accepting the fact that we would be limiting extensive or broad-based programs.

Secondly is to expand the aid-based-upon-need concept to student-athletes in all sports and to include consideration for incidental expenses similar to what was presented in the Peter Likins study and proposal.

It would be more consistent philosophically with the broad-base concept and also allow us to provide more dollars for student-athletes who actually have the need.

Weaknesses obviously are the ongoing criticisms of the aid-based-upon-need programs: the management problem, the student-athlete who wishes to be independent and the competitive-fairness issue.

Possibly, the best alternative for us to consider is to reduce the maximum number of grants in each sport but increase the maximum value to the student-athletes to include a broader interpretation of incidental expenses based upon need.

In a sense, we would be combining aid based upon merit and providing more extensive aid based upon need to cover the incidental needs that are expressed by the student-athletes. This addresses the issue of cost cutting in our programs and yet provides opportunity for student-athletes to receive additional support, if needed.

None of these approaches is refined and they need extensive study; but I am hopeful that from the study, we will recognize that cost-cutting measures should not include cutting aid to student-athletes, but we should consider alternative ways of assisting student-athletes to a greater extent than currently exists.

Lastly, I am concerned about the student-athletes' response to the relationship with coaches. The report gives indication that less than 30 percent of the coaches are doing an excellent job in assisting student-athletes outside of the sport.

If that is true and if we accept Executive Director Schultz's philosophy that we should be educating student-athletes to become more productive citizens, our coaches are neglecting their responsibility in this educational process.

Are we placing so much emphasis upon winning in order to generate income that coaches and administrators have lost sight of the educational objectives?

Each of us has a difficult task—that is providing an opportunity for the student-athlete to pursue excellence in a sound educational environment while conducting a program in a fiscally responsible manner.

I am convinced that the key to the future of intercollegiate athletics lies with the quality of people involved, and we must utilize sound educational criteria in selecting staff and hold it responsible for its actions. If we only retain coaches based upon their wins, regardless

of their integrity and educational values, no legislation will solve our problems in intercollegiate athletics.

Mr. Massengale: Thank you, Mr. Dempsey, for sharing with us your perceptions from an athletics director's point of view.

I am pleased to present to you as the next speaker for this afternoon's panel Edward T. Fort, who is the chancellor of North Carolina A&T State University, also a colleague and member of the Presidents Commission.

Edward B. Fort (North Carolina A&T State University): Before beginning my remarks, I would like to say that one thing I will do when I get back home to Carolina is to tell my kids I have had a chance to interact with probably the world's greatest female athlete. I want to congratulate her and her colleagues here for the honors luncheon this afternoon.

My statements will be departmentalized into three areas of concentration as they relate to the study and as it pertains to the issue of implementation for us as leaders on campuses. The three areas, as I view it, certainly represent fodder for down-range perspective legislation as conducted by the NCAA.

No. 1 is time demands on athletes. No. 2 is expanded academic support services, and No. 3 is the issue of personal expenses of athletes. With those three as touchstones for my remarks, let me start at the top of the key.

The recommendations are four- or five-fold and include the following:

No. 1—the identification of legislation that will ultimately eliminate spring football practice.

Now, this issue, my colleagues, has been explored by the delegates assembled more than once during the past four years.

It is now time to attempt at least to put the issue at rest once and for all, or at least to bring it into close perspective.

Spring football practice does not eliminate football injuries. There is no medically approved study of which I am aware that denotes the longitudinal relationship between spring football and eliminating regular-season football injuries.

It is time, therefore, that Division I personnel, as well as other divisions, get on with it in relationship to football practice. The time devoted to this spring practice could be better spent involving student-athletes in the academic enterprise designed to insure graduation on time.

No. 2—strictly limit the hours of practice for basketball and football in season and off season. The more time devoted to Division I basketball practice, the more time additionally the coaches and some ADs will want.

The same rule of thumb ensues with respect to football. The more practice time devoted to the sport, the more time the coaches want. To me, it is nonsense. It is time to put an end to the extraordinary amount of time devoted to both football and basketball practice and big-time sports under the aegis of Division I and perhaps even Division II or even Division III.

Athletes who are expected, for example, to report for practice, basketball that is, at 5 a.m., as I see it, just simply goes too far. That means that given the NCAA's propensity for conducting a study before actualizing or operationalizing a new policy, let's try to study it and see what happens. So again, strict limitations on hours for practice in season and out of season.

No. 3—across-the-board academic support services. It is incumbent upon the lesser campuses within Division I, particularly I-AA, to devote more dollars than ever before to academic support services. The survey suggests that educational resources for the most successful competitive football and basketball programs in the country are "more than adequate."

They are in some cases, as I am sure you appreciate. That adjective cannot be used to denote the status of academic support services on the less-than-endowed campuses within, particularly, I-AA. Somehow, vigorous pursuit must occur in relationship to what occurs as far as these kids are concerned in that arena.

Now, this pursuit must be made by the NCAA in terms of strategies and delivery systems designed to insure certain minimal levels of academic support services available to all Division I football and basketball teams nationally.

The current practice is one that provides those teams that reside in the top 20, as I see it, an unfair advantage. Hence, their opportunities and chances for pushing student-athletes into a graduation mode are greatly enhanced.

The lesser universities do not have the nonstate fiscal resources necessary to match these kinds of academic support services.

Hence, it would be wise for the NCAA to set aside dollars on some kind of formula-inspired basis designed to provide supplemental income for budgets of those less heavily endowed campuses and assure those dollars are specifically earmarked for enhancement of academic support services on those campuses.

No. 4—eliminate any increase in personal expenses for student-athletes. The current system of financial aid resources does not do anything other than perpetuate the chasm between the haves and the have-nots within the Division I structure.

The promulgation of that system by increasing the lawful income for student-athletes, as I see it, is unconscionable. Why should the teams in the top 20 for basketball and football be given yet another advantage in relationship to the dollars that are provided for student-athletes who sign letters of intent at said campuses?

What we need is a move in the opposite direction. The expense dollars should be mapped out on some kind of formula basis that eliminates the unfair advantage currently present with the teams in the top 20 to 25. The expense dollars should be allocated to student-athletes in a formula manner.

It is not necessary, I would simply say, to suggest that X number of scholarships would be available for football players in I-AA, for example, or basketball players in Division I. Because aside from the

dollars that are available for scholarships, moneys are also available for educational expenses.

We all know that educational expenses are allegedly greater with the prestigious campuses than is the case of the athlete who attends the campus located in the backwash of the bottom 40. You know, the time has come to bite the bullet, and it will assist in the elimination of personal expense money as far as increases are concerned.

Now, these recommendations, as I see it, are actualized in bringing some semblance of equity between the institutions. They will not eliminate the gaps between the haves and the have-nots, but they will certainly do something about serving to lessen same.

In finality, one more count with regard to this issue on limitation on hours as it pertains to spring practice: The youngster who appears for practice on the basis of strong suggestions by his coach or her coach at 5 a.m., practices until 8 o'clock classes, and then resumes practice at 2 p.m., is literally, absolutely exhausted when the time arrives for the youngster to leave the training table and move to the campus library or study hall.

The NCAA Presidents Commission should commission a task-force research project designed to determine precisely what the upward limits should be with respect to hours devoted to both basketball and football practice in season and during the off season.

The task-force membership should consist of athletics directors, basketball coaches, football coaches, presidents and faculty advisers. It would be a good idea to ask that task force to undertake an analysis of the pros and cons associated with, again, the elimination of spring football practice, given the NCAA's, again, propensity for conducting a study. That, as I see it, is the way to go. Thank you very much.

Mr. Massengale: Thank you, Chancellor Fort, for sharing those ideas with us. I think you all, as I do, appreciate the way that Chancellor Fort disguised his recommendations. Maybe next time we will suggest that they be a little more forthright.

It is a very great pleasure to work with him on the Presidents Commission. You can always tell where he stands on an issue, and that is very refreshing.

Moving on with the program this afternoon, now it is my pleasure to present to you Christine Grant, who is director of women's athletics at the University of Iowa, Iowa City.

Christine H. B. Grant (University of Iowa): Although my primary goal today is to suggest ideas that will improve the student-athlete's experience, I must first confess my disappointment with the research team's attempt to accurately document the time of student-athletes in their endeavors.

In the entire questionnaire, there were only seven questions that dealt with student-athlete's use of time, generally, and the student-athlete's use of time in athletics, academics, social activities and extracurricular activities.

From these seven questions, only one dealt with the critical issue:

the amount of time required in intercollegiate athletics, only one question in the entire questionnaire. That one question had two parts.

(A) The total number of hours spent per week on the sport in season.

(B) The total number of hours per week spent on the sport out of season.

There were no guidelines. Perhaps this one aspect could and should have been the focus of one complete in-depth study. Certainly, we must ascertain accurately the extent of the problem if we are to provide solutions to the problem. I suspect, because of the lack of in-depth questions, that we have failed to collect accurate data on this particular issue.

I believe that the results of the study may have underestimated the problem in this instance. For institutions willing to fully express the time involvement of the student-athletes, I would suggest that four to six segments of the athletics experience should be identified; namely, a typical preseason week, a typical in-season home-events week, a typical in-season away-events week and a typical off-season week.

Within each of those four segments, the student-athlete should be asked to consider each of the following time demands on a daily basis: practice sessions, actual practice time, team meetings, film viewing, weight training and conditioning, injury treatment, preparation time for dressing and safety, postpractice time, showering and dressing, and miscellaneous, which could include such things as mental training.

For competitive events, the student-athletes should consider the present competition time; the length of the event itself; the postseason; the postcompetitive time demands, and then in addition to all of the above, the average time for travel should be requested.

Unfortunately, none of these variables was identified in the one question relating to the athletics time demands. Hence, we are left with no knowledge of how many athletes consider each of these variables.

Therefore, for my first suggestion, I would recommend that each institution in Division I conduct its own in-depth study to determine an accurate assessment of the time demand on its student-athletes.

Now, ideas for lessening this pressure on our students: I have divided these into three idea categories.

1. Ideas for institutional consideration.
2. Ideas for conference consideration.
3. Ideas for national consideration.

One, in particular, is very similar to that given by Chancellor Fort: institutional measures to enhance academic performance.

First, I would recommend the appointment of an academic achievement committee composed of faculty whose responsibilities are clearly identified. I also would suggest that institutional policies set by this academic achievement committee be appealable when extenuating circumstances warrant an appeal. Athletics programs, in my opinion, need such a safety valve.

This committee's responsibilities could include:

1. Approving all athletics schedules that determine days and times of departure and return.
2. Limiting the number of academic days that can be missed due to competition during a quarter or a semester.
3. Insuring that a quiet room for study be designated on all away trips of more than 24 hours.
4. Conducting exit interviews with graduating student-athletes to determine (a) that the athletics time commitment is indeed reasonable, and (b) that adequate academic support is being provided to our student-athletes.
5. Prohibiting competition during exam periods and X number of days prior to each exam period. Note again that that appeal to the academic achievement committee can be made for conference and/or postseason competition since they are difficult to schedule.
6. Adopting a procedure currently used successfully by one Big Ten university whereby the student-athlete who falls below a specified GPA is required to meet personally with the members of the academic achievement committee to explain why. This method has been very effective in reducing the number of student-athletes in academic trouble.

Conference measures:

1. Where possible, schedule conference competition and championships to utilize Fridays, Saturdays and Sundays as opposed to other weekdays. I also would make this suggestion to the NCAA for the NCAA championships.
2. Investigate the necessity of teams arriving the day before the event in order to practice at that institution's facilities. For certain sports, the practice time could be scheduled after late arrival on the date of the event.

National measures to enhance academic performance:

1. Consider reduction of the number of games in each sport. Certainly, the reduction of the number of men's basketball games would have financial ramifications. This can be taken into account. However, the reduction of baseball games, for example, has limited financial significance.
2. With the exception of the outdoor sports such as tennis, golf, softball and baseball, limit the competitive season for all sports to one semester. This would mean that the competitive season for basketball, for example, would begin January 1 or thereafter.
3. Encourage the outdoor sports to spread their competition over two semesters to avoid the current heavy, heavy demand just prior to final exams at the end of the academic year.
4. With the exception of swimming, prohibit two-a-day practices during an academic term.
5. Restrict teams from scheduling more than two competitive events per week.
6. Guarantee that all student-athletes will be given one day per week that is void of any athletics demands.

7. Establish a maximum number of hours per week that can be applied to our student-athletes in their athletics endeavors.

I suggest that each NCAA sports committee be permitted to recommend the daily hours it believes to be reasonable for a particular sport.

In preparing for this presentation, I worked under two assumptions:

1. That this body sincerely wishes to consider ways in which to decrease the amount of time demanded of a student-athlete in athletics programs in our institutions of higher learning.

2. That national legislation designed to enhance the academic performance of our student-athletes is preferable to institutional-type factions and athletics demands that, according to all of our coaches, could result in competitive suicide.

Of the recommendations I have made today, I would single out the most important as the proposal to establish a maximum number of hours per day that can be demanded. Yes, it will be difficult to monitor, but I maintain no more so than any other rules that we currently have.

Yes, there will be critics who will say the quality of the game will be affected. I think not. The good coaches will make efficient use of the time allowed. No, it will not disadvantage any individual program; for with national legislation, we are all equally affected.

In other words, together we can live with almost any restrictions if we are all under the same restrictions. I believe it is from this perspective that we must approach our problems; and from this perspective, it may be possible to seriously consider some significant changes to improve both the academic and the athletics experience for the student-athlete.

Yesterday, Dick Schultz reminded us that our primary mission is to educate our young people in order to prepare them to contribute to our society. I reinforce that concept by presenting my suggestions to you today, and I also reinforce Dick's charge to this Convention to welcome positive change.

I believe the ideas being presented today are ideas for positive change, and I urge us to embrace the challenge.

Mr. Massengale: Thank you, Christine, for those remarks. I can see we are going to have a lively discussion at the end, with the different viewpoints being presented.

At this time, it gives me great pleasure to introduce to you Jackie Joyner-Kersey, one of the truly outstanding athletes of our time. She will be speaking today as a former athlete, one who was a student at UCLA; and I know she will not be inhibited in her comments that she will be sharing with us this afternoon.

Jackie Joyner-Kersey (University of California, Los Angeles): Thank you. Speaking from a student-athlete's point of view, what I feel is most important to a student-athlete is time management. What I feel that the institution should do is teach student-athletes about time management as soon as they come in the door and not allow them to utilize their time in a way that is not going to benefit them in

the long run. I feel that there are some of us who don't know how to manage our money. So how can we manage our time if we think our time is just to be spent just like money? I do feel that the institution should teach student-athletes about how to manage time so they can benefit and get all they can out of that time.

Secondly, I feel, contrary to public opinion, that as student-athletes we do care about our grade point; we do care about our academics. I do feel that we need help in the avenue of balancing the two: how to balance academics versus your athletics, and not just utilizing your athletics ability to go in the classroom just to sit there. "Okay, I am there, and not learning anything"—but learn something from the class that you can eventually use later in life. So I do feel being able to balance the two is very important.

I did briefly read through the report, and I can only speak in my behalf about socialization. I think where it said some of the athletes felt isolated, I feel from my personal opinion that if you feel isolation, it is because you isolate yourself.

If you allow yourself to sit in a corner so you can't communicate or relate with others, then I feel that is your fault. I don't think that is an institutional problem, because neither the coach nor the AD can pull you off in a corner and tell you not to communicate with the rest of the campus.

If you allow yourself to get caught up into that or caught up into a corner, then I blame it on the athlete. I am not blaming it on the institution; I am not blaming it on the coaches or the AD.

I do feel, as an athlete, I am one who will try to communicate with everyone and try not to isolate myself. And just because your name is in the paper every other day, you should not feel you should be out on this high pedestal where nobody can touch you.

I feel you should be able to communicate with other people. In some sense, some people might not agree with that. Some athletes like to be way off in a corner somewhere. That part I don't agree with, as far as isolation and socialization.

As a student-athlete, when I was going to UCLA, I really didn't care too much about my social time. I have my priorities set up. I have my own goals of what I was trying to work toward. If I want to socialize, I socialize with people.

But as far as going out and going to parties, that wasn't a part of me. I wasn't there to do that. There are some student-athletes who love to party and love to go out and love to do other things besides studying and trying to be successful. So that part of socialization was not a part of my repertoire. That is something that I didn't really care about.

Finally, I think most important at all NCAA institutions is self-pride. I think self-pride comes from coaches, the ADs and the presidents. I feel we all have a self-pride about our universities and what we all are representing.

I do feel that if we allow the coach to get away with (something), then the AD allows the coach to get away with it and the president

allows the AD; then the athlete is going to get away with it, too. So I feel that if we start at a very high level, at the top with the presidents or the chancellors, the AD and the coaches, then the student-athletes are not going to get away with so many of these things they try to get away with.

So, if we take self-pride in our institution and self-pride in what we are about, then some of the problems that we are running into can be alleviated, or we can eliminate some of them. So, I feel that most important is self-pride.

Then also, going back up to the top, talking about time management, teaching a student-athlete about time management; then also teaching them about how to balance the academic versus the athletics. Then also dealing with the socialization of it.

I feel if we can pull all of these together, then maybe we could come up with some, I hope, great solutions and not some limitation for cutting out funds here and cutting out scholarships there and not allowing everyone to utilize the benefits or utilize the NCAA system.

Before you make any drastic decisions about cutting anything, I hope you seriously look at some of these possible implications that I have presented. I don't know if you can use them, but I hope so.

Mr. Massengale: Thank you very much, Jackie. We certainly will take those into consideration. Coming from an athlete, a former athlete, they do mean much to us. Thank you so much.

The next person on our program this afternoon is Jeffrey Orleans, who is executive director of the Ivy League schools, the Ivy Group, as they are known, who is going to share with us his viewpoints from that perspective.

Jeffrey H. Orleans (Council of Ivy Group Presidents): Thank you, Martin. I am not sure this is so much an Ivy perspective as it is a conference commissioner's perspective. I have noted that I am the only conference commissioner among the 50 or so of us here today who is on any of today's panels. So in a sense I hope I am speaking for all of my colleagues and the commissioners in all the various divisions in the NCAA.

We do in the Ivy League have 32 championship sports, and about 15 percent of our undergraduates are varsity athletes of some kind. So, I hope that lends some kind of real-world basis to what I am about to suggest. Actually, I have two suggestions.

One I hope will extend a little bit what Jackie Joyner-Kersey just said and something that I think underlies Christine Grant's remarks. That is, that the young men and women who are under our charge as student-athletes come to college asking us to help them be the best people they can be, both as athletes and as students.

That suggests to me, when we set up our athletics and academic programs, when we make rules, when we set up our academic services, when we set up our living arrangements, we owe it to them to step back a minute from the competitive and financial nature of all these arrangements, which we all have to think about, but to step back from those arrangements for a minute and try to figure out what

will actually help our student-athletes become the very best people they can.

What will help them grow? What will help them make the right decisions, which is, after all, what they want to do? We send them a powerful signal, as Jackie said, when we set up institutional athletics structures. Ultimately, our student-athletes make their own decisions, but we have a tremendous hold over the kinds of decisions they make and the kinds of attitudes they deliver about themselves in making those decisions.

So I guess my first counsel would be to all of us, as we try to arrange our affairs institutionally, and as conferences and nationally, to step back a little from the practical and financial and competitive aspects and see if we are thinking clearly about what will work best for the young men and women who are going to class and competing and going through our institutions and try to provide them with the very best philosophical and practical situations that we can.

Secondly, and I hope more practically, I would really like to emphasize the role and the opportunity that conference membership presents to try to resolve so many of the difficult issues that we discuss today and that are in our conference programs over the next couple of days.

Once again, we have in the neighborhood of 150 proposals for national legislation coming through at an NCAA Convention. All of us know that if we continue to enact 150, or even 100, national changes a year, we simply will have to call Wil Bailey back and rewrite the Manual every year; but we will not necessarily solve the kinds of problems we talk about.

Christine was right when she said we ultimately need national rules in each division so that we know we are under the same umbrella. I think all of us, especially all of us in Division I, know that we can't go simply from a need for some change to a national rule; a national change, without a whole lot of experimentation and activity and change at the institutional and conference levels so that we will all have a chance to find out what works, so that we can go to each other and can say that I tried this and I know what works, or I have tried this and I know it doesn't work.

My conference, for example, does use, particularly in the winter sports and in some spring sports, the Friday, Saturday and Sunday scheduling format that Christine discussed. We have used it for many years. It has a number of advantages, and it has some disadvantages.

But we have used it long enough so we are comfortable doing it, and we are comfortable being able to talk to any conference or school that wanted to ask us about both what is good about it and what is bad about it.

We recently have gone through a very long process of deciding which kinds of travel and which overnights among our institutions should provide for overnight travel and which shouldn't. It sounds like a very mundane task; but until we chose to address it as a conference, we had no idea how much of the time of our athletes and

coaches we could actually save.

We did that, and we implemented it and it turned out to be fairly easy. There is no magic in doing that, but it took, finally, a desire on the part of the conference members that the conference should go out and do that.

In many of the other issues we have discussed this afternoon, it is very clear that if we wait until a national change, we are going to have a long wait. Ced Dempsey very articulately portrayed the desire, at least of some portion of students and members of the Pac-10, to retain spring practice in football.

His words were barely into the microphone when Ed Fort stood up and equally articulately told us why we should not have spring practice in football. It seems to me that as difficult as it is, the only way we will eventually have some change in that is if conferences in I-A and I-AA or Division II choose to experiment on some basis with not having spring football and in seeing what those results mean for them.

Ced also outlined three different proposals for changes in financial aid. Ed Fort also spoke to that issue. We have a very long proposal on the Convention program that deals with financial aid, the first comprehensive financial aid proposal that we have had in five or six years.

I think it is clear to all of us that there is a major hesitancy in adopting any of those changes, to go from one national system to another national system. It seems to me the only way we can overcome that hesitancy is if individual conferences can decide to try on an experimental basis those changes in financial aid that make sense to them.

There is some risk in that, certainly. There is some risk in being the first group of schools to do anything very differently from the way the rest of your division does it. But we already know that is possible.

The Big Ten, for example, is proposing satisfactory-progress changes that are in the Convention program because the Big Ten has operated under those rules internally for some time and believes they work. Others of us may disagree with that approach.

But the point is that this conference has taken it on itself to have perhaps a more severe set of guidelines than the rest of Division I, and it has managed to live and prosper within those guidelines.

I would like to close with a reference to something that Merrily Baker said at a meeting of the group that was convened to provide background for an earlier Presidents Commission Forum. Merrily was then still at Minnesota, and she was discussing our attempts to look at academic-progress rules.

She said essentially, "You know, we have spent a lot of time talking about how to make sure that everyone is at least minimally qualified and makes minimal progress. When I go home, I am not going to talk to my student-athletes about whether they are making C's, I am going to talk about whether they are making A's."

It seems to me that is, after all, the philosophy that we should be

looking at. It is not to find the easiest or the most acceptable rule that all of us can work with, it is to find the best rule, the rule that challenges our young men and women to their utmost, that we can work with. I would simply suggest that a practical place to begin doing that is, to gather together as conferences. Thank you. (Applause)

Mr. Massengale: Thank you very much, Jeff, for those comments and perspectives.

The next individual on the program perhaps has a little different vantage point than some of us on the campus who have to deal directly with athletics and academic programs at the same time.

Charles Reed is the chancellor of the State University System of Florida. He has a wide array of institutions within that system, and I know many different athletics programs.

Charles B. Reed (State University System of Florida): Thank you, Martin. To begin my comments, I want to borrow a line from Gov. Mario Cuomo of New York. He recently told an audience in Washington that back when he was thinking about running for the presidency of the United States, late one night the devil came to him and offered him a deal. Gov. Cuomo said, "He offered me the presidency in exchange for my soul. I said, 'What's the catch?'"

I think we can think about the report of the American Institutes for Research in this light and ask the question, if we are going to have big-time intercollegiate athletics in an environment of academic excellence, what is the catch?

That catch is, I think, not that we are trying to do two things that are totally incompatible, but that we have lost our sense of proportion and our sense of priority. We often hear conversations within the NCAA that come to the conclusion that we must not kill the golden goose — meaning television contracts.

Well, I think that the golden goose really isn't broadcast revenues, but American higher education itself. Our sense of proportion should tell us that. Anyone who has trouble deciding whether education or athletics is more important should recognize that we can easily have higher education without athletics.

Ask yourself, what would we do differently if tomorrow there was no such thing as intercollegiate athletics? We would still teach every course in the college catalog. We would still conduct research at the same or a greater pace than we do now, and we would still perform public service from our institutions.

What we wouldn't be doing in American higher education is bending or breaking the recruiting rules, stealing players and coaches from each other, struggling to keep our more rabid and fanatical boosters and alumni under control, and trying to prevent the academic reputations of our institutions from being mocked or disgraced by our athletics programs.

Ask yourself another question. Is there another single reason why more university or college presidents have had to resign or be dismissed than problems in athletics? Finally, ask yourself this one: What is more important in the life of a student-athlete, winning or

graduating? I say graduating is more important, and I think the real values of our universities are not merely what we say they are.

Our real values are reflected not in words but in the way we conduct ourselves in the universities and colleges. No institution is value free. We either live up to the high standards or we don't. Sometimes, the recognition of our own imperfections prompts us to consider abandoning all pretense of amateurism and declaring the condition of the scholar-athlete an unattainable myth. We saw great examples of that scholar-athlete at lunch today.

Some say we should openly pay our athletes, not require them to make progress toward a degree, and create a semiprofessional feeder system for professional sports. I disagree. I think that the way to avoid hypocrisy is not to abandon our ideals and values, but to make a greater effort to live up to them.

So, we return to the issue of setting a priority. I think that priority ought to be graduate on time and at the same rate, if not at a higher rate, than the rest of the student body. Notre Dame, Penn State, Duke show us clearly that it is possible to do.

I know this can be done because I have seen it happen time after time where people pay attention to it. I think we have to set graduation rates, not the score of the games or the won-lost records, as the priority in the universities and the colleges, for three reasons.

First, it gives the student-athlete a chance at life after college. Second, it sends the right message to the younger students in the junior and senior high schools of this country. Third, it preserves the values of our society and of our colleges and universities. Let's look at these three points one at a time.

The first point is the future of our student-athletes. Our system today sends — yes, to name two athletes from my own system, Deion Sanders and Sammy Smith — off to the National Football League without degrees, to make millions of dollars.

Those two students will make enough money that, with some good advice, they will be set for the rest of their life even without degrees. But if they would just have finished college, they would be in a better position to evaluate that financial advice they will get.

So, they will always have the basis for a second career after their knees give out. But they are just two in a million people, probably. Most of our student-athletes, as the study said, never get a shot at professional sports. Most who do don't last long enough to have what could reasonably be called a career as a professional athlete.

What about those people who have been exploited now competing in the job market with former students who earned a degree? Ask yourself this question: Which applicant would you rather hire, someone whose academic focus was on merely remaining eligible for sports, or on graduating? Someone who barely passed freshman algebra or someone who majored in computer science?

Second, we need to send a message to the younger student and the junior high schools and the high schools of the nation that goes beyond the message of Proposition 48. We need to tell them that sports

can be a meaningful part of life, but hardly anybody makes a living in sports.

Your odds of becoming a rock star or an astronaut are about the same as starring for the New York Knicks. We need to tell the next generation of student-athletes that if they are unprepared academically to do college work, they can forget about playing college sports. In my experience, there are few better motivators for athletes than threatening to withhold participation in sports. Make it stick, and you will make them work.

Third, making academic success the true focus of intercollegiate athletics keeps us true to the purpose of our colleges and universities. Education is what it's all about, not touchdowns, hook shots or home runs.

So let me make the following four proposals in reaction to implementation of the study:

1. Abolish spring training for football and reduce basketball schedules. This report tells us that athletes spend less time on the books than they do on sports. Let's cut back on some of the athletics distractions.

2. Reduce eligibility from four years to three, and let the freshmen find out where the library is and experience a degree of academic success early on.

3. Report annually and in the newspapers our graduation rates by institution, by sport and by gender. We have started doing this in Florida, and we are beginning to see the results. Until now, only the coaching staffs have been held accountable, because we don't keep score in the academic arena. Let's start keeping score and compete with Notre Dame, with Penn State and Duke, not just on the field but on commencement day, too.

4. Let's extend the score-keeping to junior high and senior high schools by making it clear that we do not recruit and will not accept as athletes students whose grades and test scores predict academic failure.

I realize not everyone is going to agree with everything I have said here today, and that is fine. But I think one thing we all can agree on is this: Education is what it is all about, and if we can make graduating the priority of every student-athlete, we will be dealing honestly with our student-athletes, we will set a positive example for younger students coming up, and we will be true to the values of our institutions.

Otherwise, when the devil offers us a bowl bid in exchange for our souls, we will ask, "What is the catch?" Thank you very much.

Mr. Massengale: Thank you, Dr. Reed, for those comments and also for those recommendations.

To finish our panelists this afternoon, it is our good fortune to have John Slaughter, who has had a wide experience in academic and athletics institutions — from Division I to Division III. I think that is a broad perspective.

I have had the good fortune to work with President Slaughter over

a number of years, and I also respect his opinions, his viewpoints, and I know that he preceded me as chair of this Commission. He was the chair of the Commission when the AIR study was sought and initiated. I know that he will have many sage comments and observations to share with us this afternoon.

It is a real pleasure and honor to bring to this podium at this time John Slaughter.

John B. Slaughter (Occidental College): Thank you very much, Martin. Good afternoon. It is a great privilege and pleasure to be here in San Francisco with you this afternoon and to have an opportunity to make one or two comments concerning the AIR study and the work of the NCAA in examining and, hopefully, implementing some policies and procedures that will grow from it.

I first want to commend you, Martin, and the Presidents Commission for the excellent work that has been done by you and President Bernard Sliger and the other members of the Commission in carrying out the work of this Forum.

I was a participant in the decision to support the research effort that we are discussing today. While I share the feelings that others have mentioned already—that it would have been desirable if we could have done some other things, added students who work equivalent number of hours per week, or add students who are just ordinary students in order to obtain some comparisons with them—I, nevertheless, feel that in spite of the fact we were unable to do those things largely because of economic reasons, there is much that we can learn, much that we can obtain, from careful study of the recommendations and of the data.

Already Cedric and Christine, Jackie, Ed, Jeff and Charles have identified a number of observations and some recommendations. I will not attempt to repeat any of those.

Many of those I can subscribe to and support.

I am going to talk about only one recommendation that really supports one that Charles Reed raised, which I think is fundamental to each of us.

First of all, let me say that I think we need to be honest with ourselves and recognize that all of us who are engaged in the administration of intercollegiate athletics programs—whether it is a chief executive of the campus or the assistant, or a conference commissioner, an athletics director or coach, or a person who is involved in any other area of administration—have to recognize that we have a principal responsibility in terms of sending out signals to young people, signals that will help them recognize that the principal reason for them to attend the college or university is to receive an education.

I am afraid we have not sent that signal adequately. I believe we are being dishonest when we pretend that we have. I wish there were another word for it, but dishonesty is the only word I can think of, in terms of the way in which many of us, and I include myself, have addressed the issues of intercollegiate athletics.

As one of the persons who supported this study, as I said earlier, I think there is one danger I want to point out, and that danger is to recognize that most of what we have seen thus far is represented in the terms of averages. The average student-athlete spends 30 hours a week in his or her sport and spends 26-plus hours per week in the classroom.

The average student-athlete lives in a dormitory with other student-athletes. The average student-athlete participates in class with other student-athletes. We have to be very careful and recognize that averages allow us to continue that dishonesty.

Certainly, there are superb student-athletes who 25 years from now will appear at an honors luncheon such as the one that we had today. They are not identified by averages.

Those students, like those within our schools today, are A students.

They are students who are in engineering and premed, in the arts, humanities, political science. They challenge our definition also of averages. It is dishonest not to admit that they exist.

But similarly, there are students in our colleges and universities today whose academic careers border constantly on incipient probation, in fear of academic ineligibility, whose transcripts sometimes reflect a smorgasbord menu of courses that prove that they are truly majoring in football or majoring in basketball.

They also are a challenge to our definitions of averages. It is dishonest to pretend that they do not exist. I contend that there are far too many of the latter, and we are being dishonest when we pretend that things are better than they really are.

There are many myths surrounding intercollegiate athletics. One of the myths that we discussed at a previous Forum is that intercollegiate athletics is making a lot of money that goes to support the college and university.

There was another myth, a myth that I think is even more insidious, and that is a myth that we as a society, we in America, tend to perpetuate. That myth says that athletics achievement is the way out of the ghetto and out of an environment of limited life options.

We are dishonest when we perpetuate that myth. Each one of us in this room can think of one or two persons where, in fact, that is true, where athletics endeavor has provided a way out of the ghetto or a way out of an environment of limited life options.

The problem is that there would be so much overlap in the one or two names, that I would guess in this entire collection in this room we probably would not come up with more than a dozen that we could agree upon who satisfied that criterion, which is an indication that, in fact, it is only a myth and a myth that is perpetuated by sportswriters and the media and far too many of us in the academic enterprise.

We are being dishonest when we perpetuate it. It simply is not true; but unfortunately it is believed by hundreds of thousands of people in this country and, unfortunately, it is believed by those young men and young women whom we find spending all of their time on the playgrounds and the basketball courts of our cities throughout the

country.

It is a cruel hoax that is repeated so often that it becomes a part of our society. It is education, not athletics, that provides the path for migrating from an environment of unemployment, illiteracy, drugs and despair.

It is dishonest to portray it differently.

Unfortunately, you and I—people who know better—have not made that point strongly enough to many of our young people. Despite the fact that I agree with many of the points made by President Fullerton, for example, this morning, I believe that it would be dangerous for us to equate participation in football and basketball with participation in arts and music in a college experience.

Even if an athlete, as pointed out by Charles Reed, is fortunate enough to earn a living in professional athletics after college days, the length of time is generally so short and the proportion that do so is so small that it is a typically small percentage of all those who engage in intercollegiate athletics during their college and university days. A major in football and basketball is not the same as a major in arts or music, insofar as a lifetime of achievement is concerned.

I would say, Charles Reed, that I would agree with your comment about graduation. I would simply say that there is one thing more important than graduation, in my opinion, and that is education. I am concerned about the fact that sometimes we use graduation rates to cover up the fact that not much education has occurred.

It gives the appearance of education, but it sometimes is a facade. I think we have to be concerned about the quality of the education that our young people are receiving. Perhaps the Presidents Commission posed its own question when we asked AIR to do a study of intercollegiate athletics, and we said, "What is the role of intercollegiate athletics in an academic institution?"

I think a more important question is what is the role of education in the life of an intercollegiate athlete; what is the academics in the life of an intercollegiate athlete? Future reports may shed some more light on these topics, and I hope they do.

I think that is the fundamental issue that all of us in the NCAA must address: the question of how do we insure that our students are receiving an education, an education that will prepare them for a lifetime, not simply something that will prepare them for four to five years of participation in professional athletics.

There are far too many of them using college as a means for doing that. I never thought, over the past few years, that I would ever find myself in agreement with the comments made by the sportswriter John Feinstein, but there is one that I do agree with, and that is, as Charles Reed said, we should make certain that freshmen have an opportunity to spend some time becoming acclimated to college before being put into the pressure cooker of a high-level intercollegiate athletics program, particularly in the sports of football and basketball. I include men's and women's basketball in that regard.

I think it is unconscionable for a student-athlete to have spent time

playing, sometimes in as many as two games, before school begins, before he has an opportunity to participate in the classes. I say "he" because it generally occurs in terms of football.

I am concerned about the pressure that they face when they are thrown into the middle of a high-pressure athletics endeavor. I am concerned about the fact that the signal that we are sending to them is that athletics comes first, followed by academics.

That is a signal that unfortunately is reinforced far too many times in their careers in college. I think that is the reason why education sometimes plays such a relatively small role in their lives. I am concerned with that message.

I am concerned that athletics first, academics second, is reinforced by all of those things that we seem to be doing in our athletics programs without stopping to realize that we are implanting very strongly in their minds a mind-set that leads to some of the problems that we have seen evidenced in intercollegiate athletics.

I am concerned when those students most in need of emphasis on academics are de facto denied it by the amount of time and the amount of pressure that are placed upon them to excel in their athletics programs.

I cannot accept the arguments of economic insolvency or economic problems that will result if freshmen were prohibited totally from participation in competition, instead of being placed on a limited regimen of conditioning and practice, a more controlled regimen of conditioning and practice, and getting a solid foothold in their educational experience.

We should not accept lightly data that suggest that athletes devote such relatively little attention to their studies, that athletes are experiencing more time in sports than they are in classrooms and in studies, that athletes are living primarily in situations in which there are other athletes surrounding them, or that athletes are in classes primarily with other athletes. We must be very concerned about that.

I hope that the NCAA and I hope that the Presidents Commission will continue to raise these kinds of points; and that as we consider the possibility of implementing some changes, we look at the very substantive changes that will be necessary to change the picture so that five to 10 years from now, we will not have the same kind of data presented as before.

It will be necessary for us to do this if, in fact, the term student-athlete is not going to be a oxymoron and, in fact, that we try to address the needs of that set of athletes who are not that small minority who are A students, who are taking the strong courses in mathematics, chemistry, engineering and premed, but, in fact, are those students who are so badly in need of recognizing at the outset of their educational experience that it is important to achieve a quality education if one is going to escape the deprivations that so many have come by. Thank you very much.

Mr. Massengale: Thank you, President Slaughter. I think you have heard this afternoon many different viewpoints, many sugges-

Presidents Commission National Forum 117

tions and many ideas. It is the part of the program now where we will give you a chance to ask questions or add your own suggestions.

First, I know the last two speakers have given some rather specific suggestions, but I am going to invite the other members of the panel, if they want to, to make any specific suggestions for the study or for legislation following this study.

We will start with you, Cedric. Do you have anything you would like to add?

Mr. Dempsey: It seems like a long time ago that I was up here, and I guess it was. Let me say a couple of things. As I was sitting here, I felt like I was a lone wolf there for a moment, and maybe I am. I don't feel that we are in total disagreement.

We possibly are in disagreement philosophically on a couple of issues as presented by a couple of members of the panel up here.

No. 1, I do not see anything in conflict with pursuing excellence through physical activity and pursuing excellence through mental activity. I guess that is where I am coming from when we talked about that. I do think there are ways of controlling that.

The best way to control that, as I have said to you before, I really believe starts with the people. You have good coaches, you have people who have good teaching techniques, and I think you can accomplish both and they are not incompatible.

The time demand—I like the point that Chris makes regarding doing local, conference and national studies. Obviously, what we have done here is a good start at the national level. I would encourage each of you to consider doing that at your own institution. We have found that very rewarding in our setting.

I made reference to a couple of comments earlier; but to give you an example of how we have approached that philosophically and from a practical standpoint, one of our concerns has been the amount of time golfers miss. I think that if you study your golf programs; the athletes are going to miss probably more time than any other sport that we have, or close to it.

The question we begin to ask, can they perform academically and miss that many classes? So, we have to go back philosophically and try to determine how they were performing. As I indicated, we found that our women golfers were performing extremely well despite the fact they are a top-10 program and missing a great deal of classes.

If they are not, then I think institutionally we have to decide do we want to pursue excellence by having a top-10 type of program and having them miss classes? Our intercollegiate athletics committee looked at this carefully and decided, at this point, we still want to do that.

At some point in time, if we find that is in conflict with the academic pursuits, I think we may relook at certain programs and say they are more for participation.

So, I would like to suggest to you that you study at your local level, and I still believe that we can best control the time demands upon student-athletes at the local level rather than through national

legislation.

The other point I would like to make, I thought Chancellor Reed was going to carry his scenario one more step. I suspect, Charlie, if you did all of that, you wouldn't have a job.

Let's keep in mind, and I talked about this earlier, that is in relationship to one of the principles of the Division I intercollegiate athletics, is public service.

No one has talked about that today. That is one of the roots of our evil.

If you want to get at all the concerns that you have academically, I can tell you how to get rid of it in a hurry. Take the dollar out of the principle of Division I intercollegiate athletics and fund them through the educational system as we do all other programs, and you will be back into a setting where you can control a lot easier.

People, we must recognize that there is a public-service aspect to our programs that probably is not going to change, and the best job that we can do in order to work within that system is to have good people dedicated to working with young people toward instruction and education; and I totally agree with Chancellor Slaughter, what we are in this for is for people to learn—a good learning, educational experience.

All of the statistics on graduation rates, of GPAs, are really somewhat meaningless if we are not learning and moving toward a proper educational base. So, I say if you want to control this issue, do not expect us in Division I athletically to try to support ourselves financially, because that is where we have come down to the base of most of the problems. Thank you.

Mr. Massengale: Thank you for those additional thoughts.

Well, having nothing more from the panelists, I think it is time in the program that we give the audience a chance to ask questions or to react or to offer suggestions. Let's do that at this time. Who would like to be first?

Bernard Sliger (Florida State University): I would like to ask Jackie her feeling about freshman eligibility, as expressed by Chancellor Reed and President Slaughter.

Ms. Joyner-Kersee: My thought on freshman eligibility is that if the student-athlete comes into a university and he or she doesn't meet the requirements to enter the university, then I feel that student-athlete should spend that total year preparing for what it is going to take for them to be successful at their university.

I do feel that some high schools don't prepare student-athletes to go on to the college level.

So, if that student-athlete is having a difficult time before going to the university, they are going to have a difficult time throughout the school year.

Mr. Massengale: One who doesn't come in with any academic problems. Should they sit out the freshman year?

Ms. Joyner-Kersee: Okay. First, the student-athlete who comes in without any academic problem, I think he or she should compete

that year. If they come in there with a strong academic background; and once they are into the university system and have proven that they can both study well and compete well, then they should be allowed to compete that whole year.

Also, the student-athlete should be allowed the tutors that are available to them, such as the study hall, and also take the time to utilize those study halls. I don't feel that a student-athlete in any university, having met the requirements, should be penalized by sitting out that year and just concentrating on academics, because that individual has proven himself, proven to us that he could do both academics and athletics very well.

David Wagner (Georgia Southern College): We are dealing today with change, change in athletics; and I think the Presidents Commission Forum has been real good for us through the last two years to consider some ideas that we have to consider.

I think we are really talking around the subject. When we talk about academics and athletics, we have been studying academics in athletics since the early 1900s; and we know that if the student is admitted with good grades, he is going to be a reasonable student.

If he is an athlete, he is going to outperform the nonathlete, and he is going to graduate on time and graduate at a better rate. That is not our problem.

In dealing with change, I think we have to look at our major state institutions, the people who are now in our top 20, the people who have the political pressures, the people who have more of the problems. In I-AA and I-AAA, Divisions II and III, we don't have the political problems that they have, and we have reasonable programs.

Let's look historically at what has happened in public education over the past 20 years. In the 1950s and '60s, we were flunking people out of school—the academic integrity. When the 1970s hit, we found unrest on our campuses, and we had to deal with the topic of integration. That happened to hurt the integrity of our institution.

At the same time, we saw student enrollments going down, and now, the word is retention. Let's keep these students in school. Let's retain them; let's deal with student unrest; and what happened? We saw grade inflation through the 1970s. I will come back to it.

In the 1980s, we are now balancing out. Our state institutions are saying let's limit our enrollment and let's go quality. The state legislatures are responding by giving them more funding. Now, our major state institutions over the past 20 years have changed in nature.

Twenty years ago, 30 years ago, 25 years ago, we were open-door institutions. Then we became more limited with our admissions restrictions. Now, many of our great state institutions educate only the elite. We are dealing with major restructuring in institutions that are great academic institutions, that are only taking the top 10 percent of high school classes. Herein lies our problem, because within those institutions, a 700 score is not enough and 2,000 is not enough.

I should ask the Presidents Commission to study the subculture that we have on our campuses that is hidden in this 40,000-student average that we have. There is a subculture of students which does not meet the admissions requirements on our campuses at major research institutions, and, therefore, one reason is because their institution has to remain competitive.

We will find, traditionally, that the same situation happened with the Ivy Leagues in the 1900s. What they did at that time, intercollegiate athletics was very important to them as they built their institutions. Now, you find intercollegiate athletics more sensible on their campuses, because they no longer need you to promote their institutions. Our major research institutions are in the same position right now.

Secondly, study the subculture; secondly, understand that our coaches went through their training in the 1970s—many in the 1970s, in the time of unrest. It was also a time when we had grade inflation, and many of our coaches went through college without really having to work, without having to really have strong academic backgrounds. Those are the coaches we have coaching for us. They are what they have been. We need to retrain them. Thank you.

Richard Landini (Indiana State University): I should like to address two points—specifically to Mr. Dempsey's observation—and if it is allowable, to ask a question.

The question is honestly asked. I should want to be sincere in the statement. It seems to me that Mr. Dempsey, in observing that if we wanted to really address the issues, many of the issues, the correlated issues in academics and athletics in our time, that we might fund athletics programs in the style and in the manner of our funding programs, from anthropology to zoology, as we fund academic programs?

The implication that I wanted him to discuss here was the observation that it is ridiculous or that is illogical, absurd in our time. I wonder if he would want to address that more specifically. I would like to know his definition and anyone else's definition of the public service that athletics performs.

I don't contest it. I should like to know if that observation and that definition square with mine, or maybe the definition of public service is distinct, for example, from public entertainment.

How and in what ways athletics serve the public as distinct from entertaining the public, making it worthy of the funding arrangement in higher education different from the funding of, say, the department of anthropology?

Mr. Dempsey: I will try to remember both questions, if I can. I was not being facetious on my first statement or the last statement I made regarding funding. I really believe that if you look at the major problems that we have in intercollegiate athletics, they are related to dollars or the lack thereof; and they drive many of the problems that we have in our intercollegiate athletics today.

I don't think it is at all uncalled-for to look at institutional funding

for intercollegiate athletics. There are still some institutions that do that, and certainly Division III institutions, in most cases, fund their programs through an educational base. I don't see that.

I think a couple of institutions, the University of Wyoming—if their representatives are here they might respond—I know they used to submit their budget and expenses that were approved, and then any revenues went back into the university. That is an approach and option that certainly could be studied. I think that should be.

The second part of that, as it relates to the public-service aspect: It is hard to imagine one not seeing the public aspect of that when you look at the number of people who attend ball games. There is a great collegiality that comes out of there and a great community spirit that comes out of that. There is a feeling of unification that occurs sometimes within a community.

I am not placing a value judgment on that, whether that is good or bad. But that is our society. In our society today, we do look for those kinds of areas to be associated with. So I would really say that it is as much a unification of programs and unification of participation by spectators, and basically by the entire community.

That is not expressed very well, but I will be happy to respond, if you want.

Mr. Landini: Am I to understand, sir, that the service to the public, that what you meant by public service, is participation of fans in the stadium or in the arena? Is that so?

Mr. Dempsey: I do feel that as a public service that intercollegiate athletics—as does drama, as do our music events on campus—provides entertainment for the general public, and I think there is value in this. I think our society has accepted that as a value.

So I do not see that incompatible with the educational goals or the university goals. Our university states that we are part of teaching, part of research and part of public service. Those are three main objectives at the institution, and I suspect most of your institutions say that.

If that is true, then, sir, I would say that you can certainly justify Division I intercollegiate athletics based upon those principles.

Frederick Humphries (Florida A&M University): I wanted to ask the question in the context that it seems to me what a panelist has suggested is not less regulation of athletics but more regulation.

All the implications of the studies, the sort of recommendations that have been made, say that we should make more rules, more specific rules in the governing of intercollegiate athletics on our campuses.

It seems to me one of the great problems that we are always dealing with in terms of legislation is that we play on a level field. So a lot of rules that we have in the NCAA are things that are looked upon as not the right thing to do, but making sure that one does not have a competitive edge over the other person in terms of selecting athletes, in recruiting athletes, so everybody sort of has their hands tied and are not permitted creativity in the course of things because everybody

has to do the same thing.

In other words, we have a piece of legislation that says one school cannot bring an athlete to the campus early to educate them unless everybody else does the same thing. So we have to pass a rule to say that if one school is permitted to do that, everybody is permitted to do that; and the logic of doing that is to say we equalize competition so one can't do what the other one does, and we keep it that way.

So, I want to pose a question to the panel. Is it possible to think in terms of conducting intercollegiate athletics with less specification of legislation and rules, and to outline, say, the cardinal sin that thou shall not do it?

The broad parameters of Blacks, if you run a program where the graduation rate of your athletes is less than the graduation rate of your normal institutional student, that is a cardinal sin. If you don't do that, you are given broad latitude to do things that you have to do to have pursuit of excellence in the athlete, but to get the athletics job done.

One thing thou shall not do, thou shall not have a lower graduation rate than your normal school. If you commit that sin, then, you pick the devil's choice, Charlie, "You go to hell."

Another cardinal sin—and I want you to react to this—is thou shall not immorally remunerate athletes. If you are caught doing that, that is a cardinal sin and you suffer the consequence.

So, I wonder if you have thought about athletics and operating it with the cardinal-sin principles, and you outline what those major cardinal sins are; then you provide institutions broad latitude toward achievement in not permitting those cardinal sins instead of all this specific legislation, which would be what I think the guy was talking about.

If you pass 150 rules a day, which nobody is going to be able to keep up with, you will not get the job done; and next year, you will have to come back and pass another 150 rules, and, at the same time, not get the job done.

So is there is any merit in trying a different approach to this whole business of intercollegiate athletics and the governance of intercollegiate athletics with broad parameters that says you get the death penalty if you commit one of the cardinal sins?

As long as you don't do that, you have broad latitude to be excellent in athletics and you have broad latitude to be excellent in education. How you do it is left to your creativity, your resources and all of that.

Forget all this junk about leveling the field.

Let's play good athletics and let's graduate them, and who gets what, that is okay—let them have it. Don't commit those cardinal sins.

Mr. Dempsey: I think the big problem, being serious, is it is very difficult to agree upon what are our cardinal sins. Who is going to determine what is a cardinal sin? How many read, about one month ago, a coach said that giving money to an athlete traveling home to visit a sick grandmother is not immoral and not a cardinal sin, as I

would understand your interpretation?

So, I think the big problem, it seems to me, is how do we define what a cardinal sin is? We have been trying to do that historically.

E. M. Jones (Grambling State University): At the risk of being verbose, I would like to digress perhaps just for a second.

Athletics in the true sense does serve as a public service. It is entertainment. In a number of cases, it provides an opportunity for individuals at any community to get to know each other.

If you will allow me, simply from the standpoint of the rich and the poor, because there are rich athletes and poor athletes; they compose the booster groups. There are black student-athletes; there are white student-athletes; there are parents who compose the booster clubs.

The relationships between the poor and rich, and the Black and white, or what have you, would not take place as much as they do.

So, the public service that it serves for me is simply giving an individual or individuals an opportunity to see that Black, blue, yellow, white, pink, orange and turquoise individuals have the same likes, or some of the same likes, some of the same dislikes; and the public service that it serves is simply giving the individuals the chance to work together.

If anyone objects to that, then so be it. But it is more than an entertainment kind of situation, which is evidenced from those of us who are here now. There are a number of Blacks who have said to me they had to stand in the wings or could not attend NCAA Conventions; but with the advent of black students playing more and more and more, then it allowed other individuals within the NCAA to see that Blacks could play a meaningful part.

Mr. Massengale: Sir, I think I interpreted that to mean that there is educational value in competition and interaction among students of different backgrounds, and that is part of the service orientation perhaps in athletics as well, as the entertainment value.

Mary Roby (University of Arizona): I would like to get back to the topic of education. I would just like to make one statement, and then ask one question.

I think that the comments Chris made about the things we could do to help athletes to be able to take care of their studies as well as their athletics were very good. I think the NCAA and all of us as individual institutions have to do this.

But not once here today has anyone said one word, unless I missed it, and I have not left the room, about the responsibility of the athletes. For example, I asked the question about the class time missed. I was quite shocked to find out that football players missed two days a week of class time. At our institution, if they go to class, when it is possible for them to go to class, they would not miss that kind of school.

So I think that we have to talk on two things: One, what can we do as educators, what can we do in our studies, what can we do in our rules and regulations that will help these young men and women get an education?

But I think that balancing that, and just as critical, is what must

they do if they are going to help themselves get an education? Nobody helped Jackie do that long jump. She had to do it herself. The coach helped her, teammates helped her; I will say she got some help; but in the final analysis, she had to do it or she couldn't have done it.

I think the same thing is true with education of our athletes. I would like to ask them questions about how many times have you missed class when you didn't have to? How many hours a day have you studied for every hour you spent in class?

So, I guess I want to make the statement that I think it is a two-pronged fork that we have got to go after; and that is, one, we have to do everything we can do as educators, and I consider myself an educator-in athletics, to help youngsters; but we also have to hold them to their responsibilities to help themselves.

Ronald Maestri (University of New Orleans): I must say that the panel has been very stimulating. I would like to ask a question.

It seems to me that I can't recall anywhere in the Manual or any legislation that says that our individual universities cannot improve our academic standards. We talk about Duke, and we have talked about Notre Dame.

I would like to ask Dr. Reed, is there anything that says that the Florida system cannot impose those same academic requirements as Duke, as Notre Dame and as Penn State does?

It seems to me that we spend a lot of time talking about rules and regulations when, individually, we can at our own university impose the regulations that we would like to see.

Mr. Massengale: I think, in response to your question, that they can set higher standards and, in some cases, they do have higher standards, but probably not universally throughout the university system of Florida.

Any other questions or comments or suggestions? We have arrived at the appointed hour, I believe, and I want to bring this National Forum to a close. The Commission is indeed deeply grateful to the personnel from AIR who were here this morning to participate in the program, as well as our panelists, both this morning and this afternoon.

I want to express my deep personal appreciation, as well as that of the Presidents Commission, for all of your participation in today's Commission Forum. I think that it is fair to say we have a rich data base from which to work, and I think our future analysis and interpretations can be made on data rather than hearsay information.

I think the Commission will be studying the report in some depth and looking at where we might go from here. I hope that any of you who may have suggestions or comments or who want to share with us thoughts will feel free to pass those along to any member of the Commission or to the NCAA office, or to me personally. We will try to take those into consideration.

I want to emphasize again that this is a base-line study. It doesn't answer all of the questions, but it does give us a good start.

NCAA Honors Luncheon

Monday, January 9, 1989

President Bailey: It is my pleasure to welcome you to the Association's 24th annual honors luncheon. Will you, please, remain standing while the invocation is given by Charles Whitcomb, faculty representative at San Jose State University and a member of the NCAA Council.

Charles Whitcomb (San Jose State University): Let us bow our heads, please. Our Father, we thank you for this day, for your loving kindness, your tender mercies, and for your abundant provisions for our great life. We thank you for talent en masse in this room, for commitment and dedication of those being honored this afternoon. Each of them has been endowed with such remarkable talent and in their own special way have made significant contributions to college athletics, academics and society. For this, we are grateful. Amen.

President Bailey: Honored guests, ladies and gentlemen: As you are aware, I have had the opportunity to represent the Association in a variety of venues during the past two years while serving as your president. But none of these experiences has provided me more personal pleasure than my participation in the NCAA honors luncheon. This event continues to gain prestige each year. This is evidenced by the outstanding nominations that we annually receive for these awards and by the fact that you attend this luncheon in record numbers year after year. You will be interested in knowing that this is another record, approximately 1,800 for our luncheon today. I am sure that my personal affinity for this luncheon results from the fact that most of my professional career has been devoted to trying to enhance academic and athletics opportunities for young people who attend our institutions of higher learning.

The individuals whom we salute here are representative of the many men and women who annually combine intellectual and physical abilities to epitomize the student-athlete concept that many of us have attempted to protect and nourish as the custodians of intercollegiate athletics programs on our respective campuses. This luncheon permits me personally to focus on the pure values of our intercollegiate programs. I join with you in saluting these outstanding individuals who best have combined the benefits that are derived from academic and athletics excellence to achieve unparalleled success in reaching their goals.

I wish that I could describe adequately for our honorees the sense of

pride that each of us shares in their accomplishments. The individuals who are seated before you truly epitomize the student-athlete concepts followed in the purpose of our Association. They have conquered personal goals, both academically and athletically, and have made significant contributions to the environments that they represent. Each of them, of course, not only has reached personal goals, but each also has met the high expectations that others have established for them. These individuals also remind us of the talented student-athletes on the campuses that we represent who similarly have reached their maximum potential, athletically, academically and socially, and who also have made significant contributions to their families, our institutions and to society.

It is their success that provides the impetus for our dedicated commitment to providing and maintaining broad-based athletics programs for men and women within the structure of higher education. In addition to recognizing the College Athletics Top 12 and the Theodore Roosevelt Award winner today, we welcome two former NCAA champions who have been selected to represent all of our athletes who participated in the 1988 Summer Olympic Games.

Before moving forward with the presentation of awards, under the leadership of Kathleen Sullivan, at this time, I wish to introduce a few people sharing the dais who will not be acknowledged specifically later in our program.

Only the time limitations of this program prevent me from sharing with you all of the reasons why I have developed tremendous professional and personal respect for our secretary-treasurer over the past two years. I, of course, had known him from our work together prior to his election as an NCAA officer, but that acquaintance did not expose me to the depth of his wisdom. He has been a truly trusted counselor on issues confronting intercollegiate athletics, and he is a loyal and caring friend. As many of you know, he underwent surgery during the past year; but, as you would suspect, he continued to place the affairs of the Association foremost in his rehabilitation agenda. The Association has confronted in this period of transition a number of crucial issues over the past two years, and it was comforting and encouraging to me, and to the other officers, and I know to the members, to have our secretary-treasurer leading us and pushing us to develop workable solutions to a variety of problems. He has completed his term with dignity and unparalleled dedication to working on the affairs of the Association. I am pleased to present to you Thomas J. Frericks, vice-president and director of athletics at the University of Dayton. (Applause)

The next individual was introduced yesterday at our opening ceremonies. He has been on an unbelievably fast pace the last 18 months, as was summarized in his presentation on the state of the Association yesterday. During this period, he has provided exemplary leadership for our Association. It is with pleasure that I recognize our Executive Director Richard D. Schultz. (Applause)

Now, it is a distinct honor for me to present our master of

ceremonies for the program today. For many of us, she is an early morning, long-distance friend who gets our day off to a good start with her interesting commentary and interviews on "CBS This Morning." For others, she may be remembered as the first woman to anchor network sports coverage of the Olympic Games. But to her journalistic colleagues, Kathleen Sullivan is considered one of her profession's most versatile news reporters as a representative of CBS News.

Kathleen has interviewed a broad range of national and international personalities and has reported on a variety of events during her career, including the historic summit meetings between President Reagan and Soviet leader Mikhail Gorbachev in Washington and Moscow. A business administration and speech communications major at the University of Southern California, the Pasadena native began her career as a news anchor and general-assignment reporter in Salt Lake City. Virtually overnight, she became nationally recognized when she was named the principal anchor for Cable News Network's evening news in 1980. Two years later, Kathleen joined ABC News and played a major role in the development of new programs, including "World News This Morning," "The Health Show" and "World News Saturday." She also served as an anchor for ABC Sports in its coverage of the 1984 Winter and Summer Olympic Games. Kathleen also served as the coanchor for ABC's "World News This Morning" and was a cohost for "Good Morning America" before joining CBS News in 1987 to anchor "CBS This Morning," which we are happy to report, has been, as you know, a network success.

Ladies and gentlemen, it is my pleasure to present to you, Kathleen Sullivan. (Applause)

Kathleen Sullivan: Thank you. To paraphrase Barbara Walters, I want to thank the NCAA for providing me with the retrospective of my hairstyles. (Laughter)

I know you went to a great deal of trouble to get some of these clips. I have not seen some of them. I was saddened because I found out that all the work on the 1984 Games that I did in Yugoslavia, as well as Los Angeles, have been destroyed. They don't have any video records of any of the commentary we did, but ABC Sports was able to provide the rest of us with clips of incredible performances by some of the athletes there.

I am here basically as a representative of CBS, but I am also a student-athlete. In 1971, the scholarships were handed out in great numbers all across the country to women, searching for quality under Title IX. I was playing tennis at the time for USC; and because I wasn't a scholarship receiver, basically my talents were dismissed. I want to take this opportunity, if I can, to make just a couple of notes about what I went through in my college days. May I implore you to take into consideration the fair treatment of nonscholarship athletes. I was denied training facilities, I was denied coaching instruction, while athletics students, of course, were provided with all. I stand

here now and I look at you, administrators and the men and women who so influence the lives of people in this most influential time. Athletics teaches all students, whether they be on scholarship or not, to handle a variety of situations—defeat, challenges, one-sided matters.

Often, I have called on the fundamentals that I learned on the playing field—principles of fairness and challenge—in later conversations with Dukakis, Bush, DeBakey, Kissinger or Schultz. Athletics taught me to adhere to those principles in my professional life. Thank heaven that I learned all that early in college. Because of my treatment in college and the priority given scholarship athletes, I learned at an earlier age the importance for me to understand fairness and equality. I want you to look across this country at others like me who are not on scholarship but who love athletics. Despite what these people do achieve, you do have more friends out there if you do look once again to the nonscholarship athletes. (Applause)

I am not here to represent athletes, I am here as a part of CBS News. We have a huge, huge man of the year at CBS. His name is Neal Pilson. Many of you know who he is. I want to talk about this man. Any person who can make my high school principal, the head of the convent, Sister Carlotta, look at me yesterday and say, "Gosh, CBS, that is the place to be in sports now, isn't it?" Well, that is all because of Neal Pilson. This year, with his successful negotiation of the major baseball contract, the 1992 Games and a continuing relationship with the NBA and the NFL, we really consider Neal Pilson our man of the year. I know he is a very good friend of the NCAA. Can we just have a moment of recognition for Neal and all his efforts to maintain the prior relationships? (Applause)

At this time, I would like to call your attention to your program to review the list of 90 individuals who have received NCAA postgraduate scholarships during the past year to continue their education. The program began in 1964; and since that time, the Association has invested more than \$3 million to assist almost 2,000 students in pursuing graduate credit. The chair of the Postgraduate Scholarship Committee is seated to my right. He is Ralph Floyd, director of athletics at Indiana University, Bloomington. (Applause)

No matter what the ratings were, it was a tough time for NBC Sports this year in carrying the games in Seoul. However, the performance the athletes were able to show us over in Seoul, Korea, leaves quite a light in our memory and there are so many familiar faces that are also here today. The NCAA traditionally has provided the leadership, training and coaching for our nation's major amateur programs. This fact is proven every four years in the Olympics, but it is recognized annually in international competition that is held at home and abroad. At the 1988 Games, in sports that are sponsored by the NCAA, the United States won 30 gold medals, 17 silver medals and 17 bronze medals, for a total of 64 individual and team events. Student-athletes who attended NCAA member-institutions earned all but four gold and two bronze medals won by our country in those

events. A total of 158 medals, which represent individual events, relays and team sports, were won by our student-athletes from NCAA member institutions.

Each of us has our own special memories of the Games. For some, it could have been Greg Louganis' incredible suffering when he hit his head diving; Florence Griffith-Joyner's dominance in the women's sprints; Andre Phillips upsetting Edwin Moses in the 400-meter hurdles; the women's basketball team's repeat championship performance or one-handed Jim Abbott leading the baseball team to a gold medal; Karch Kiraly's leadership in volleyball; or the dominance of California high school swimmer Janet Evans, who now will be chasing NCAA championships in the years to come.

Today, it is my pleasure to introduce to you two gold-medal winners at Seoul. They provided special memories for me, and they are here with us now. May I introduce to you Jackie Joyner-Kersey, University of California, Los Angeles, Track and Field. Jackie Joyner-Kersey established herself as the best woman athlete in the world during the Olympics by winning gold medals in both the heptathlon and the long jump. A graduate of UCLA, she won the NCAA heptathlon championships in both 1982 and 1983 and holds the collegiate and world records in this event.

John Smith, Oklahoma State University, wrestling. The memory of John Smith's exuberance after winning the gold medal in freestyle wrestling often is replayed in my mind when I reflect on the Olympics. John twice won national titles in the 134-pound division while representing Oklahoma State University and was selected the most outstanding wrestler in the NCAA championships.

Jackie Joyner-Kersey is here, by the way, to represent all current and former athletes who participated in NCAA competition and in the 1988 Olympics.

Jackie Joyner-Kersey: Thank you. I would like to give honor to God first, and I would like to thank the NCAA for its support of women's athletics as well as athletics in general. I would like to thank the family of UCLA, and I would like to say a big thanks to Judith Holland. Before I walked in the doors of UCLA, she said the first thing you must be is a student and then an athlete; and to me, that philosophy meant a lot, because I knew I was blessed with an athletics talent. But, I also knew I had to work hard in the classrooms to be successful.

I think that is the reason I am where I am today. I did study hard in the classroom, and I did utilize the tutor system. I did utilize all the doors that were open to me. I do feel we as student-athletes must utilize and try to help others along the way. We must continue to promote higher education; and I just feel that we, as student-athletes, have a great impact on a lot of people that we don't know. We, as student-athletes, can touch a lot of lives and can open a lot of doors for a lot more people.

The NCAA has opened a lot of doors for people. UCLA has opened a lot of doors for me. I feel that being able to give back to the

community, give back to the school, give back to my family is more important than anything else. If I can leave with you one thought, that is a quote that I carry with me: "What you share shall multiply and that which you hold back on shall diminish." God bless you and thank you for your support.

Ms. Sullivan: The College Athletics Top 12 permits the Association to honor six outstanding student-athletes from the preceding year and six former letter-winners who have distinguished themselves in their chosen professions on their silver anniversary as college graduates. The criteria for each of these categories, as well as the members of the NCAA Honors Committee, are listed in your program. Now, I take great pleasure in introducing the current student-athletes to you.

Dylann Duncan, Brigham Young University, Volleyball.

Even before the season had reached the midway point, it was easy to document Dylann Duncan's influence on volleyball at Brigham Young University. With several games remaining, Dylann already had established five BYU career records. She also duplicated those standards for aces and blocks in High Country Athletic Conference statistics and subsequently surpassed the career record for total kills.

Dylann earned all-America honors while ranking in the top 20 in four national statistical categories and was a top candidate for player-of-the-year recognition. She was selected to the High Country all-conference team each of her four varsity seasons and to three NCAA regional all-tournament teams. She was a member of the USA's national B-team last summer.

The Cougar cocaptain also earned academic all-America honors and established a 3.350 grade-point average, majoring in electrical engineering. Dylann has been active in the Utah Special Olympics. She has collected food and assigned gifts for children as a Sub-for-Santa chairperson and has devoted time to the ill and needy for the Latter Day Saints Church. A member of the Golden Key National Service Society, she is an officer in Phi Beta Chi and the National Electrical Engineering Society and holds membership in the National Society for Women Engineers. Ladies and gentlemen, Dylann Duncan, Brigham Young University.

Dylann will receive her award from Lu Wallace, BYU's director of women's athletics.

Suzanne T. McConnell, Pennsylvania State University, Basketball.

One of the individuals responsible for America's gold-medal success in basketball was one of its shortest players. But this was not a revelation for Susie McConnell, or for those who have followed women's basketball closely the past four years. Susie long has been considered one of America's outstanding players. She was a consensus all-America who was called the "heartbeat" of Penn State basketball. Her reputation as a playmaker earned her the distinction as the premier point guard in the country.

Susie set an NCAA career record with 1,307 assists, or 10.2 per

game. She twice led the nation in assists and ranked second the other two years that she starred for the Nittany Lions. But passing the basketball was not Susie's only strength. She averaged 20.7 points per game and is the first basketball player to total over 1,000 points and over 1,000 assists in a career. Susie was presented with the Frances Pomeroy Naismith Hall of Fame Award, which annually is presented to the nation's top player under 5 feet, 6 inches tall, and she established 22 Penn State records. She is a four-time all-Atlantic 10 Conference guard; she was named to five international basketball teams, leading the United States to wins in the 1986 World Championships and the 1985 Jones Cup.

Susie also has been active in community and charitable work and was the subject for a "roast" that benefited Pennsylvania Special Olympics. She earned a 3.020 grade-point average while earning an elementary education degree. The NCAA postgraduate scholarship honoree has participated in numerous activities that benefit school-age children. Ladies and gentlemen, Susie McConnell, Pennsylvania State University.

Susie will receive her award from James I. Tarman, director of athletics at Pennsylvania State University.

Betsy Mitchell, University of Texas, Austin, Swimming.

Betsy Mitchell, quite simply, is one of the world's premier swimmers in the backstroke. She won seven NCAA individual titles, leading the Longhorns to three consecutive national titles. A three-time champion in both the 100- and 200-yard events, she also won the NCAA championship in the 200-yard individual medley and was the high-point swimmer in the 1987 championships. Betsy has been a member of our nation's past two Olympic teams. She earned a gold and silver medal in 1984 and also placed fourth in Seoul.

Betsy has been captain of the U.S. national team since 1985. She was selected swimmer of the year by the American Swimming Coaches Association and was nominated for the Sullivan Award in 1986. The 1988 Southwest Conference Female Athlete of the Year holds NCAA and American records in both the 100- and 200-yard backstroke and set the world record for 200-meters at the World Aquatics Championship trials. A two-time all-America who also received the conference female scholar-athlete award, Betsy earned a 3.368 grade-point average.

She received the Darrell Royal Endowed Centennial Scholarship for combining academic and athletics excellence, the Presidential Scholarship and was a three-time recipient of a Helm's Academic Scholarship. The NCAA postgraduate scholarship honoree held membership in the prestigious Friar Society, Omicron Delta Kappa leadership honorary, Kappa Delta Pi education honorary and was involved actively in Special Olympics on the state, national and international levels. Ladies and gentlemen, Betsy Mitchell, University of Texas.

Betsy will receive her award from Beverly Hadaway, chair of the Women's Athletic Council at Texas.

Anthony Phillips, University of Oklahoma, Football.

Over the long and distinguished football history that has been established in the Big Eight Conference, only three former student-athletes have been selected first-team all-conference each of their four varsity seasons. This year, Anthony Phillips became the fourth to add his name to this select list when he completed his senior season at the University of Oklahoma.

A two-time all-America selection, Anthony twice was nominated for Big Eight offensive player-of-the-week honors; and he has been one of the primary reasons that Oklahoma has won three conference championships. During his career, the Sooners twice have led the nation in rushing and finished third and fourth the other two years. Anthony sustained a knee injury requiring surgery last spring, but the rehabilitation obviously was successful.

The grades that he consistently received from his coaches critiquing game films have paralleled the 3.400 grade-point average the academic all-America established, majoring in business. He also is the first Big Eight athlete who has earned academic all-conference honors each of his four seasons. He volunteers much of his time to youth groups and to other charities. Following this luncheon, he will depart for Tokyo to participate in the Japan Bowl. Ladies and gentlemen, Anthony Phillips, University of Oklahoma.

Anthony will receive his award from Daniel G. Gibbens, faculty athletics representative at the University of Oklahoma.

Thomas Schlesinger, University of Nebraska, Lincoln, Gymnastics.

For the past several years, Tom Schlesinger has worked diligently to earn a spot on the United States Olympics team. He was making important strides toward fulfilling that dream until he sustained injuries during his senior season at the University of Nebraska that prevented him from molding his talents into peak form for the NCAA championships and the Olympics trials. His outstanding abilities, however, were recognized by the Gymnastics Coaches Association when he was elected to receive the Nissen Award, which annually is presented to America's outstanding collegiate gymnast.

Had the Olympics trials occurred after Tom Schlesinger's junior season, there is little doubt he would have been in Seoul. Tom won NCAA championships in both the all-around and on the parallel bars. Tom won five Big Eight Conference individual titles on the rings and parallel bars. He led Nebraska to one national and three conference titles. The Cornhuskers were second nationally his other three years. He also earned a gold medal in the 1987 Pan American Games and competed for the United States in a dual meet against the Soviet Union.

A member of Gold Key Scholastic Society, the NCAA postgraduate scholarship recipient earned a 3.995 grade-point average while earning a degree in chemistry. He currently is enrolled in the University of Nebraska Medical School. Ladies and gentlemen, Tom Schlesinger, University of Nebraska.

Tom will receive his award from Martin A. Massengale, chancellor

of the University of Nebraska, Lincoln.

Mark Stepnoski, University of Pittsburgh, Football.

Mark Stepnoski established himself as one of the nation's premier football players last fall when he finished second in the balloting for the Outland Trophy, which annually is presented to the nation's best interior lineman. He had earned all-America recognition as a sophomore offensive tackle at the University of Pittsburgh, but a season filled with personal injuries prevented him from receiving the national recognition that had been expected for him as a junior. This fall, however, he fulfilled all of his expectations, and those set by others who have been associated closely with his career, by earning consensus all-America honors. He captained the Pitt team and will play in the East-West game on Saturday.

A two-time selection to the academic all-America team, Mark has been invited to join the university's honors college. He established a 3.400 grade-point average, majoring in communications and is an NCAA Postgraduate Scholarship honoree. Making himself available to people less fortunate than himself has been a major priority for this man. He is a leader in Pitt's John Allen Pruitt Memorial Visitation Program, which invites athletes to devote personal time to critically ill youngsters at the university's Childrens Hospital; and he has also devoted time and energy to aiding disabled veterans with frequent visits at the nearby veterans hospital. Ladies and gentlemen, Mark Stepnoski, University of Pittsburgh.

Mark will receive his award from Mike Gottfried, Pitt's head football coach.

Mark will respond on behalf of the current student-athletes honored here today.

Mark Stepnoski (University of Pittsburgh): I would like to begin by congratulating Dr. Ebert and the Silver Anniversary Honorees as well as the six award recipients. It is truly an honor to be standing here in such distinguished company and to be representing this club of six awardees. On their behalf, I would like to extend our gratitude to the NCAA, which sponsors this award and which also, more importantly, sponsors intercollegiate athletics. That sponsorship has helped many people through the years to receive an education and has provided the opportunity to excel in the classroom and on the playing field as well. I think everyone here recognizes the importance and values of athletics and the role they can play in shaping character.

The achievements of the people who are being honored with the Top Six Awards, while they are substantial, are secondary to the accomplishments of Dr. Ebert and the Silver Anniversary Award winners. If any of the six of us are fortunate enough to find ourselves on this stage 25 years from now, we will be able to say that we have truly fulfilled the quest for excellence that began with our participation in intercollegiate athletics. Obviously, you don't have to participate in or excel in athletics to be successful in other areas of life. But, there is such an abundance of practical values inherent in athletics—

discipline, preparation, commitment, perseverance, decision-making under pressure, and physical and mental competence—which all play a part in attaining a goal that has been set.

Deeply relevant is the fact that the people who are being honored alongside me today realized early on in life that sports are only one small part of a much larger picture in the theme of the athlete's life. While sports will teach you the positive and negative examples, the fulfillment of potential that can result in success, and while the lesson might begin in the gymnasium or the swimming pool or on a football field, you also assume that one is applicable in the classroom and in really all walks of life. The ability to first recognize and then to maximize your own strengths in areas where you not only have potential, but which you also enjoy pursuing, is critical to succeeding. Most importantly, the true mark of a champion is not always in winning but rather in knowing you have done everything possible to approach victory.

Again, I personally would like to thank the NCAA for this opportunity to speak to you today on behalf of the other Top Six Award winners. Thank you for honoring us in this special way. (Applause)

Ms. Sullivan: And now we salute the Silver Anniversary honorees. Before we begin, this one is very special to me. It is tough to be likable and a very tough investigative reporter, but somehow this man does it. He has been one of the real delights for me in coming to CBS News, just to be associated with this man.

Ed R. Bradley, Cheyney University of Pennsylvania, Football and Track.

Over the past 12 years, Ed Bradley has established himself as one of the premier news reporters in this country, no question. He, of course, is a familiar visitor to numerous homes on Sunday evenings as part of CBS television's highly acclaimed "60 Minutes" program; and we have learned to expect his presence at major news events that receive complete television news coverage, including terrific commentary this summer at the conventions, I might add.

He joined the CBS Paris bureau in 1971. A year later, he was transferred to Saigon, where he was named a CBS News correspondent and sustained an injury while he was covering the Vietnam conflict in Cambodia. He was reassigned to the Washington, D.C., bureau in 1974, and then he volunteered to return to Indochina in 1975 to cover the fall of Cambodia and Vietnam. A year later, Ed was named anchor of "CBS Sunday Night News"; and in 1976, he received an additional assignment as the CBS News White House correspondent for two years before becoming a principal correspondent for "CBS Reports." He became coeditor for "60 Minutes" in 1981. Ed has been highly recognized for his reporting abilities, including six Emmy Awards, the George Polk Award and citations by the Overseas Press Club.

As an undergraduate, Ed earned four letters in football, three in track and twice served as the track team captain. He was both

president and vice-president of the student government; helped develop athletics and recreational opportunities for inner-city youths and worked on benefit charities to raise money for civil rights causes and for educational institutions. Ed is an advisor to the board for the Benton Fellows Program at the University of Chicago and for the University of Southern California Quill Award. He is an active patron of the Boy Scouts of America, the Police Athletic League, both the Studio Museum and the Dance Theater of Harlem, and is a member of the Schomburg Center Board of Trustees. Ladies and gentlemen, Ed Bradley, Cheyney University of Pennsylvania. I don't think I have ever seen you, Ed, so humble.

Ed will receive his award from Andrew Hinson, director of athletics at Cheyney University. (Applause)

Mel Counts, Oregon State University, Basketball.

Mel Counts always has believed that his success as a basketball player carried with it an obligation to give freely of himself to children who expressed an interest in participating in athletics. This commitment began while he was earning all-America honors in basketball at Oregon State University, and it has intensified over the past 25 years.

For example, he has given more than 400 speeches to schools, churches, civic organizations and youth groups; participated in Athletes For A Better America, which provides sports clinics in economically deprived metropolitan areas, and actively represents the Fellowship of Christian Athletes on the West Coast. Mel is one of college basketball's most distinguished performers. He played on the 1964 gold medal Olympics basketball team; earned all-coast honors three consecutive years and still holds 14 Oregon State records, including 48 points in a game, a 26.7 scoring average and 16.9 rebounding average in a season, and averaging 22.2 points and 15.4 rebounds in a career.

He graduated with his enrolling class at Oregon State, majoring in humanities, social science and education. Mel was elected to the Blue Key Honorary Society and was a member of Beta Pi fraternity and the FCA. He played professional basketball for 12 years, twice served as the player representative for two teams and helped the Boston Celtics win two National Basketball Association championships.

Just as he was an outstanding basketball player, he has been a successful realtor. He was elected realtor of the year by the North Willamette Board of Realtors in 1987 and currently serves as the president of the board. Mel also has been active in organizing, umpiring, coaching and administering Little League baseball programs in California and Oregon; is a fund-raiser for the Pro-Life movement; chairs his local school board, and serves his church in a number of areas.

Ladies and gentlemen, Mel Counts, Oregon State University.

Mel will receive his award from John V. Byrne, president of Oregon State University.

Tony P. Hall, Denison University, Football.

One of the most distinguished members of the United States Congress is a former Little all-America tailback from Denison University. Tony Hall, a two-time all-Ohio Athletic Conference honoree and the league's most valuable player his senior season, had a reputation for athletics excellence while setting rushing and total-offense standards at Denison.

Today, that mark of distinction has moved from those successes to a commitment to combat hunger both domestically and around the world. His concern in this important area first was evidenced when he volunteered to become a Peace Corps teacher in Thailand for two years. He entered state politics in 1969 and was elected state representative and then state senator for two and three terms, respectively. After being named legislator of the year on three different occasions, he decided to run for the United States Congress from Ohio's third district; and he has served his state and the country in that capacity for the past decade.

Tony currently is a member of the House Rules Committee and is the ranking majority Congressman on the Select Committee on Hunger. He also serves on the Foreign Affairs Committee and the Small-Business Committee and chairs the International Hunger Task Force. The Primary Global Health Bill and the Universal Child Immunization Bill are among the more significant legislation that he has authored, and he has sponsored numerous other Federal food and nutrition programs and bills that support the Philippine democratic reform.

He founded the Congressional Friends of Human Rights Monitors, is a member of the board of managers of the Air Force Museum Foundation and serves on the advisory committee of the Energy Resource Bank. A member of the board of trustees of Holiday Aid, he is a recipient of the Distinguished Service Against Hunger Award, the Jewish National Fund's Tree of Life Award, and the National Association of Nutrition and Aging Programs' Golden Apple Award, and the Asian Pacific American Chamber of Commerce Freedom Award.

Ladies and gentlemen, Tony Hall, Congressman.

Congressman Hall will receive his award from Theodore Barclay, director of athletics at Denison University.

Paul Martha, University of Pittsburgh, Football.

It is easy to spotlight for you Paul Martha's athletics achievements at the University of Pittsburgh. I am sure that most everyone present today remembers that he was a consensus all-America running back who played in three postseason all-star games and established himself as one of the premier players in Pitt football history. He also earned two letters in basketball. Take that, Bo.

But today, we wish to focus, at least in part, on a few other important aspects of Paul's life that may not be common knowledge to the public. While developing these outstanding athletics talents at Pitt, he also was establishing academic honors; earning a Bachelor of Science degree, and was elected to the Druids Academic Honor

Society, which requires a member to earn a minimum 3.250 grade-point average and to possess exemplary leadership qualities. He served on the men's dorm counsel, devoted many hours visiting sick children at Children's Mercy Hospital and later earned a Doctorate of Law from Duquesne University.

Paul's commitment to enhancing life for his fellow man continues 25 years later. He serves on the board of directors for the West Penn Hospital and for Parental Stress, a Pittsburgh community organization for the treatment and prevention of child abuse. He also has devoted more than a decade to the Epilepsy Foundation of Pittsburgh; and he is a member of the board of directors of the Panther Foundation, which is an independent body that provides postgraduate scholarships to deserving Pitt students.

Many of you may be aware that Paul was the neutral arbitrator for the National Football League's 1982 strike, and he is credited by many as the key individual responsible for bringing it to a satisfactory conclusion. Paul has been a member of the NHL board of governors since 1978. He also is chair of the Sports Law Committee of the Torts and Insurance Practice of the American Bar Association. Paul entered athletics administration in 1978 when he became vice-president of the National Hockey League's Pittsburgh Penguins and still serves as general counsel there. He was named president of the Civic Arena Corporation in 1981 and remains responsible for the daily operations of that facility. Ladies and gentlemen, Paul Martha, University of Pittsburgh.

Paul will receive his award from Edward E. Bozik, director of athletics at the University of Pittsburgh.

Kirk P. Pendleton, Lehigh University, Wrestling.

For those of you who knew Kirk Pendleton 25 years ago, you were not surprised when he became the youngest person ever to receive a chair on the Lehigh University board of trustees. The successes that he enjoyed as both a student and an athlete have been mirrored by his personal accomplishments in the past 25 years.

Kirk was one of the nation's premier intercollegiate wrestlers and won the national championship at 157 pounds in 1963. He established Lehigh's only undefeated and untied record in dual-meet competition, pinning 43 percent of his opponents, and twice finished second in the NCAA championships. He received the outstanding wrestler award from the national coaches association. Kirk graduated with honors, with dual majors in English and finance. He was a member of Alpha Kappa Psi national business honorary, received the Alumni Association's undergraduate Merit Award for excellence in academics and athletics, was a member of the town Council, and actively gave his time to youth clinics and to working with underprivileged children.

Following his graduation, he became a securities analyst in New York City. He then founded Glenkirk Farms, an internationally recognized beef genetics company. He became president and chief executive officer of Pitcairn, Incorporated, a year later and helped built it into a \$1.3 billion private investment company. In 1983, he

founded Cairnwood, Incorporated, which today controls a series of private companies with more than \$500 million in sales. Cairnwood provides employment and a high-value export product in parts of the world badly in need of both. He serves on the board of directors of 15 corporations, and he chairs seven of those boards.

In addition to chairing the endowment investment committee and serving on five other Lehigh trustee committees, Kirk is active in a philanthropic organization; a conservation group; an international and local church body; the local school committee, and serves on the board of the Academy of the New Church, a private secondary school and college. Ladies and gentlemen, Kirk Pendleton, Lehigh University.

Kirk will receive his award from Peter Likins, president of Lehigh University.

James G. Wilkinson, Duke University, Football.

Football has had a major influence on Jay Wilkinson's life since the day that he was born. He lived in the spotlight as the son of one of college football's legendary coaches, Bud Wilkinson of the University of Oklahoma. Jay shouldered those pressures better than most anyone could have expected. He first earned national high school player-of-the-year honors as a quarterback and then consensus all-America honors at Duke University as a wide receiver, halfback and kick returner. He led Duke to two ACC championships and he was conference player-of-the-year as a senior. He ranked second and third nationally in punt returns his sophomore and junior seasons, respectively, and was the nation's fourth leading scorer as a senior. He still holds seven Duke records and averaged 8.5 yards per play every time he touched the ball during his career.

Jay bypassed what could have been a promising professional career following his graduation at Duke University to enter Episcopal Theological Seminary in Cambridge, Massachusetts. After receiving a Bachelor of Divinity degree, he elected to enter public service and joined Oklahoma Governor Dewey Bartlett's staff as an executive assistant. He became a White House staff assistant for President Nixon and then returned to Oklahoma to become the state director for human relations services, a division of the U.S. Department of Justice. He then was named vice-president for marketing for the Public Employees Benefits Service Corporation in 1976, and has been president of the company the past six years. PEBSCO, under his leadership, has become the largest company in the nation specializing in the marketing and the administration of public employee deferred-compensation plans and has assets in excess of \$2.5 billion.

Active in campus and community activities, he was president of the Fellowship of Christian Athletes and served on the Duke student judicial board. Jay has maintained his devotion to his church, participates in the national fund-raising efforts of the United Way and works with Cub Scout programs, among other activities. Ladies and gentlemen, Jay Wilkinson, Duke University.

Jay will receive his award from Tom Butters, director of athletics at Duke University.

Now, responding on behalf of the Silver Anniversary honorees is my colleague, Ed Bradley.

Ed R. Bradley (CBS News): I am doubly honored to stand before you today.

First, to have been chosen as a Silver Anniversary recipient and also to have been asked to speak on behalf of my fellow honorees. We represent a cross section here of collegiate sports: football, track, basketball, wrestling. We also represent the wide level of sports programs under the banner of the NCAA. Some of us played in big-time sports programs before crowds in huge stadiums, before your glaring spotlights of the games for national television.

Tony Hall, who gets more applause when he is introduced as a former little all-America than when he is introduced as a current Congressman, told me that he played in a small program. I asked him, "How small?" He said, "Well, the biggest crowds were 8,000, 9,000 people." Tony, let me tell you about small. I played at Cheyney when it was known as Cheyney State Teachers College before Cheyney became a power in the Women's Division II Basketball, before Cheyney won the Division II Men's Basketball title in 1978. About the closest we came to a spotlight when I played at Cheyney was towards the end of the season when we were preparing for our traditional game against West Chester State, which always closed the season. In those days in November when it got darker earlier every day, towards the end of practice, Coach Stevenson would ask some of the students to park their cars at one end of the field and turn on the headlights so we could get a few more minutes of practice. That is small time. (Laughter)

We also represent here a cross section of America. We are men from very different backgrounds, women also in the Top Six. I think we represent what can be learned in college sports and applied in later years. I say this with all sincerity. I think that we represent what is possible in the United States. Jay Wilkinson grew up on the flat plains of Oklahoma under the long shadow of his father, as Kathleen said, one of the legends of football. He made his own mark at Duke; and although he could have chosen to play professional ball, he decided to go on to graduate school.

I wanted to play and I believe I could have, but I had a coach that said I should hit the books just in case the scouts never found me in the team setting.

Mel Counts and Paul Martha could not have been more different. One grew up among the tall trees of Goose Bay, Oregon. His father was a logger. The other beneath the shadows of the tall smokestacks of steel mills in Pittsburgh. His father was in the gas business. But in college, they shared similar experiences—coaches who insisted they go to class, coaches who made sure they hit the books. They played ball and they made their marks.

Kirk Pendleton would admit he was born with a silver spoon in his

mouth; but on the wrestling team of Lehigh University, he met people from other backgrounds. They competed together, they worked together, and they learned from each other and shared with each other a mutual respect based on this sport and themselves as individuals.

What we all shared in common was the discipline that came from playing our sport and the understanding that even though we were blessed with certain natural talent, that natural talent could be honed, could be fine-tuned; it could be improved through hard work and preparation. That commitment to hard work and preparation—that discipline—carried over after the playing days had ended.

On behalf of these men and all of the other athletes here today, we thank you for honoring us and we encourage your efforts to police intercollegiate sports. Keep a sharp eye on programs that push men and women to excel at the sport and cast not a glance at what they do in the classroom. Many student-athletes will play the game in college. Few, very few, will earn a living after their collegiate days are over by playing their sport. But all of them today have an opportunity to learn as we did, things on the playing field that coupled with what they have learned in the classroom will stand them in good stead every day of their lives. Thank you.

Ms. Sullivan: Now, it is time for us to turn our attention to the focal point of each honors luncheon program—the presentation of the Theodore Roosevelt Award, the highest honor the Association bestows on an individual. If you will open your program, you will see pictures of past winners of this award, which recognizes a distinguished citizen who, having earned a varsity athletics award in college, has exemplified ideals and purposes to which college athletics programs and amateur sports competition are dedicated.

You will see Bill Cosby in 1982 before he was wealthy. (Laughter) You will see George Bush in here when he was confused by some of the midwesterners who had the Alcohol and Tobacco Plan. True. (Laughter) You will see Otis Chandler. Does anyone know where Otis Chandler with the Los Angeles Times is? You will see some other people, Tom Bradley, Omar Bradley, Jesse Owens, and some of the most prestigious Americans. It is a distinguished group, including, as you will note, former presidents and the president-elect of the United States, military leaders, pioneers in space and medicine. All truly have been worthy of this recognition.

We salute today a former student-athlete who has distinguished himself as one of the nation's outstanding thoracic surgeons. He also was recognized as a Silver Anniversary honoree in this city in 1979, and he is the first recipient of that award to receive the Theodore Roosevelt Award.

Dr. Paul Ebert has been the director of the American College of Surgeons since 1986. He previously lived in this beautiful part of our country, having served as chair of the department of surgery at the University of California, San Francisco, Medical Center for 11 years. Dr. Ebert graduated from Ohio State University with honors

in 1954, majoring in mathematics and zoology, and was considered one of the nation's premier basketball and baseball players. He earned all-America honors in each sport and was the captain of the basketball team.

Paul averaged 23.4 points his senior season, and his 1,436 points and 21.8 average currently rank 12th in the Buckeye record books and earned him all-Big Ten honors three consecutive years. He had a single-game high of 40 points. As a baseball pitcher, he had a 21-7 record, including a perfect 7-0 sophomore season; and he earned all-conference recognition each year. Also, he was a member of Kappa Sigma and received the Big Ten Medal of Honor, which annually is presented to the senior student-athlete at each Big Ten institution who best combines athletics, academics and leadership.

Paul continued his education at Ohio State University Medical School and graduated cum laude. He began his residency and internship at the Johns Hopkins University Hospital and was appointed chief resident at Johns Hopkins in 1965. Dr. Ebert joined the Duke University Medical Center in 1966 and then became chairman of the department of surgery at the Cornell University Medical College. He next was surgeon-in-chief at the New York Hospital and then became chair of the department of surgery at the San Francisco Medical Center in 1975. He then joined the American College of Surgeons in 1986.

Dr. Ebert has distinguished himself as one of the nation's finest thoracic surgeons during his career. He has been active particularly in cardiology and is recognized as a leading authority in children's thoracic and cardiovascular surgery. He has served as president of four national and one regional medical associations; chaired the American Board of Surgery, and has been widely published in a variety of medical journals, including the American Journal of Surgery.

He also is active in the Chicago Symphony Orchestra and the Chicago Lyric Opera organizations and has contributed a great deal of charitable time to heart associations in different parts of the country.

He received an honorary fellowship from the Royal College of Surgeons of Edinburgh and a similar fellowship from the Royal College of Surgeons in Ireland in 1958. He was a Markle Scholar at Duke University and received both the Postdoctoral Fellowship and the Mead-Johnson Scholarship Award while at Johns Hopkins.

Ladies and gentlemen, may I present to you a man with very distinguished and very long credentials: Dr. Paul Ebert, Ohio State University. Dr. Ebert will receive his award from President Bailey.

President Bailey: Dr. Ebert, on behalf of the Association, it is my pleasure to present this award in recognition of your outstanding contributions to medical science, cardiology and thoracic surgery, and the health and well-being of your fellow man.

Dr. Paul Ebert: Thank you very much, President Bailey. Distinguished honorees, Ms. Sullivan, members of the NCAA, ladies and

gentlemen: I know I speak for all the recipient awardees seated at the head table when I express to you our appreciation for recognizing former athletes for subsequent contributions in their own respective fields of endeavor.

I will not reemphasize what we have all gained from our experience in athletics, because I think they have been well expressed today. But I do believe that all of us recognize that it has helped us in our decision-making, irrespective of our particular field of efforts. Clearly, we were all fortunate to have been part of an intercollegiate athletics program; and I think the success of these programs clearly goes to you in the room today. It is dependent upon the athletics directors, the university administrators, coaches, faculty advisors and all who have worked so hard to make intercollegiate athletics what it is.

Now, clearly, the pressures to win and succeed in intercollegiate athletics are much greater today than they were in the days that I played. Yet, I believe that it is the combination of the commitment of those of you involved today in the athletics programs to maintain some reasonable balance between athletics and scholarship that makes college athletics what it really is. I will take just a few moments to look back at my days in the early 1950s of athletics participation.

There were in those days no so-called scholarships in the Big Ten, only a job program, possibly more demanding, possibly less fair to institutions that did not have the geographic advantage of being close to a major city. But, I am sure that in many ways it was probably a simpler system. I had the pleasure of being a student member of the athletics board of Ohio State during my last two years in medical school, and it was at this time that the grant-in-aid program came forth. I think it was also my first experience, so to speak, with what the actual cost of an athletics program might be both to the departments and to the university.

All of us certainly have watched the tremendous coverage that the television networks give to athletics and sports, by which the universities benefit. I think that there is little question that from the days I played to today the fans right there on the field are in accord with you. You can make a mistake and you can't hide it in any way. We also have seen the universities diversify athletics programs, recognizing that only a small number can actually financially support themselves; but yet, we can only admire the commitment of the athletics departments and the universities to involve as many students in athletics as possible.

I believe a major compliment the NCAA deserves is to its continued strong stance on demanding reasonable levels of academic performance for athletes in order for them to remain eligible for participation. Certainly, with all the pressures brought upon you today, there is no question in my mind that this has kept this organization in the highest respect of the public, the student and ultimately the athlete. Certainly, pressures today on the entire society have been extreme

and have made many of us fantasize about life with the use of drugs; and athletes certainly have not been immune to temptations. Stresses and strains on the college athlete are greater than on the ordinary student. But, the feeling always has been on the part of athletes, as I remember well, that we almost were indestructible in those days. You combine this with more recent and more common use of steroid compounds to increase performance and body size, and the pressure upon this organization is further amplified. Yet, I think through these unpleasant and certainly adverse events, the NCAA continues to strengthen the bounds between academics and athletics.

I do not wish to anticipate what the breadth and scope of the next set of challenges will be; but I know one thing: whatever they are this organization will address them directly and in the same fashion it has in the past. Now, I know all our honorees today share my enthusiasm for these efforts; and all of us recognize there is, so to speak, life after athletics. I would like to conclude these brief remarks today with a quotation written regarding Theodore Roosevelt for whom this award was named. As most of us all know, Theodore Roosevelt was a vigorous outgoing individual. He had little respect for procrastination but much more for directness and decisiveness.

Lincoln Stevens was a friend and writer in 1898, and he said this about Roosevelt. "Roosevelt's life has been so sudden and his fighting so aggressive that most people think he never thinks, that every act, so to speak, is born of the impulse of the moment." He said then, "The public man is the private man, and his friends and acquaintances have no advantage with him over strangers."

I again thank all of you today for all of us here at the head table for making this such a wonderful occasion. Thank you very much.

President Bailey: It is now my pleasure to present this institutional plaque to Jim Jones, director of athletics of Ohio State University. This institutional plaque for Ohio State commemorates the outstanding achievements of one of your distinguished alumni.

Ms. Sullivan: It is somewhat the consensus of opinion of everybody that takes this podium today, like the honorees in this program, that we all understand the importance of striving for academic excellence and at the same time athletics achievement. Maybe the NCAA, which provides such great leadership in this country in that area, somehow can influence the high schools and the lower schools of this country so that they, too, will understand and so that the many children's egos and hopes may not be crushed once they go to college and see the tough high standards that the NCAA presents.

Thank you very much for letting me join you in this terrific honors luncheon today. I am most impressed of the people that the NCAA recognizes, and thank you for letting me be a part of this.

President Bailey: Thank you, Kathleen, for moving our program along so well today. You have done far more than that. In your opening comments, I think you challenged us to recognize and to take advantage of opportunities not yet grasped and to be sensitive and to respond to responsibilities not yet met. I think you will be

interested in knowing that in the revised NCAA Manual, scheduled for adoption on Wednesday morning in our business session, in the principles governing the administration of intercollegiate athletics, we have included a new principle not in our current Manual, approved by the membership last January, to be effective with the adoption of the new Manual. That is the principle on the welfare of student-athletes. I think no one of us here will forget the challenge you have given us, and I hope and trust we will respond effectively to that. As a token of our appreciation for your performing so ably as master of ceremonies today and as an expression of our appreciation and the recognition of the administration and respect we hold for you, it is now my pleasure on behalf of the Association to present to you this gift of crystal.

Now, may I ask that you remain seated and bow in quiet meditation as I ask Charles Whitcomb to return and give the benediction.

Charles Whitcomb (San Jose State University): Please bow your heads. Every day should be a day of Thanksgiving for the gifts of life, sunshine, water and the luscious fruits and grains that are direct gifts. Live each present moment completely and the future will take care of itself. Thank you for being present to honor these very, very special people. God bless all of you. Amen.

Division I-A Business Session

Tuesday Morning, January 10, 1989

The Division I-A business session was called to order at 9:00 a.m. by Division I Vice-President Albert M. Witte, University of Arkansas, Fayetteville.

OPENING REMARKS

Mr. Witte: Will the delegates please take their seats? Before we get to this morning's business, let's go over a few administrative matters. If you will turn to the buff-colored pages in front of your programs, Page vi, you will see under Division I-A business session our agenda for this morning. We have, first, to vote on legislation for this division. Then if time permits, it may very well be something in the nature of a round-table discussion of items of interest for this afternoon's Division I business session. Again, if we have additional time, we might review legislation of interest that will be before the assembled divisions tomorrow.

[NOTE: The procedure for roll-call voting was reviewed.]

PROPOSED AMENDMENTS

Maximum Awards—Division I-A Football

Roy Kramer (Vanderbilt University): Mr. Chair, I would like to move the adoption of Proposal No. 61.

[The motion was seconded.]

My fellow delegates, for many years there has been a rising tide of media hype; presidential proclamations; interest by the Federal government, as we have seen recently, and puritanical statements by coaches and many others concerning the integrity of intercollegiate athletics and in particular intercollegiate football, particularly as it is measured by retention rates and graduation rates. All of these sentiments has led this body constantly to temper the rules by adding page after page of legislation dealing with initial eligibility, eligibility in general and satisfactory progress, as well as reams of philosophical resolutions concerning our commitment to the student-athlete.

Yet, we have maintained a rule passed years ago that we can recruit 30 football players a year so long as we maintain that magical number of 95 with no regard for the fact that if you can take the simply multiplication of four times 30, or in some cases $4\frac{1}{2}$ times 30, or five times 30, there is no logical conclusion to that number. That rule was born of a financial pipe dream so typical of this august body, with absolutely no concern to the welfare of the student-athlete or the integrity of intercollegiate football as an integral part of higher

education.

The time has come for a change, and Proposal No. 61 offers you that change. Our executive director Sunday afternoon told us that it is time for this group of people to affect positive change and most particularly not to be afraid of change. Yet, when we mention or even slightly discuss the 30-95 rule, there are those of us who begin to shake because of the telephone call from our coach or for some other reason. It is my belief that the appropriate manner in which to address the issue of retention in graduation rate is by establishing a maximum initial number of grants—not with volumes of legislation, but with a very simple piece of legislation, which would establish an initial grant of 24 without the maximum.

I realize that the most difficult part of this rule is that it is simple; and for years, this body has had great difficulty dealing with simplistic solutions. This concept, I grant you, will place a considerable amount of pressure on our coaches to recruit student-athletes who they fully evaluate not only for their athletics talents, but also for their ability to perform academically in the classroom in order to remain on our campuses and to participate. Those coaches who do not exercise diligence in the recruiting process with regard to academic background and the potential of individual student-athletes and who do not place the proper emphasis on performance of student-athletes once they are on our campus will be faced with smaller squads and other limiting factors.

In turn, this will put greater pressure on the coach to recruit more diligently and support positively his athletes once they have arrived on our campus in order to insure a successful continuation toward a degree. Obviously, this would reward the programs that have the greatest retention and the best graduation rate. Somehow after listening to the deliberations of this group for many, many years, I thought that was the purpose of our legislative actions.

There are two major criticisms of this proposal. Number one is its cost. I could supply you with as many tables as you would like with retention rates from year to year, ranges of 92 to 95 percent with as many as 75 percent of your freshmen redshirted; and I will show you that if you do a good job, you will remain at somewhere between 92 and 96. I am here to tell you as an athletics director that if I arrive at 96 or 97, I believe I can face my chancellor because I have reached that goal not because of football but because I have done a good job with academic integrity in my program. Many of your programs, and I don't think many of you know this, already are operating above 95 scholarships because we carry all kinds of injury cases. We suddenly move people to become student-assistant coaches so that we don't really exercise their fourth or fifth year of eligibility. So, the coach can push his initial grant from 25 to 27, or whatever that number may be.

The second major criticism is that those programs which have new coaches and are not competitive would suffer greatly. Max, I have talked to your coach and, Bob, I have talked to Glenn and I know their

concerns. I am here to tell you the facts of life. You do not win consistently in intercollegiate football with 30 freshmen and 15 junior college transfers. The single most important correlation in competitive success in football, and I have studied this for four or five years now, is the age of the team you put on the field. If you can consistently put a team on that field that is 21, 22 years of age, with reasonable athletes, you will have a competitive team. But if year after year, you walk to the arena with 17- and 18-year-old freshmen and junior college transfers, you will not succeed.

Somehow, we as athletics directors, have to understand that and have the patience to work with that coach and put in place a piece of legislation that will encourage us to reach that goal. This legislation is not effective until 1991. If there is a need to adjust the figures up or down slightly in that interim period, we have the time to do it.

Ladies and gentlemen, I urge you not to react to the numbers game, not to listen to the coach who thinks that the magical solution is one more player; but rather for once let's stand up and understand the legislation that is in that book before us and the new one we are going to adopt at this Convention, that the purpose of intercollegiate athletics is to serve the welfare of the student-athlete, to bring them into our program, to maintain them as an athlete, but more importantly, to maintain them as a student over a period of time in which they can graduate. I urge you to affect positive change and thereby vote for Proposal 61 and thereby firmly establish the integrity of our program and the approach by which we intend to run it.

Homer C. Rice (Georgia Institute of Technology): I would like to speak in favor of this proposal. It is good legislation for all of the right reasons. The effective date is for those schools that do have a problem, the numbers game at this point. I think that the scrutiny by the administration and of the entire body of coaches to think of the potential for graduation is important, and this legislation puts the responsibility on the coach to be thinking in those terms. It also has the very strong appeal to improve recruitment selectivity, which is important. And, of course, the improved retention rate to improve graduation is also what this is all about. Above all, it is fair, it is simple and that is important. It does reward those that are fair.

Warner Alford (University of Mississippi): Mr. Chair, as one of the sponsors of this proposal, I would urge you to vote for it. I have asked any number of athletics directors throughout the country how we ever arrived at the figure of 95. I have yet to have anyone tell me how we got there. It just seems to me that without a ceiling we are promoting the correct way of retaining athletes. I don't think we should be penalized for retaining our athletes and graduating our student-athletes. As was mentioned several times yesterday in our discussions, we are here to graduate them. We have to fill out every year numerous reports giving graduation rates. All this is going to do is to encourage that; and really, I would like for somebody to tell me why this is a bad piece of legislation. I don't understand why it is. I would appreciate hearing from the other side.

Wayne Duke (Big Ten Conference): When I was on the NCAA staff, so many years ago, we used to keep a tally of how many times people got up to speak on this Convention floor. This is my last and 43rd NCAA Convention, and I don't plan to beat that tally list.

I speak in opposition to this proposal for the very basic reasons that brought it about in the first place: One, finances. It will cost more money to conduct an intercollegiate program. It will enhance the possibility of redshirting. Already on the 95 total limit, almost all of our institutions redshirt almost an entire recruiting class, which maintains the rich getting richer. My good friend, Roy Kramer, pointed out that the age factor is one of the determinants on whether a team wins or loses. With the relaxation of the 95-overall limit, you are going to see those persons with the capability of organizing and recruiting walk-on programs, the capability of redshirting athletes, of a higher-age squad with the better programs. Simply, the rich become richer.

[Proposal No. 61 (Page A-63) was defeated by Division I-A.]

Maximum Awards—Division I-A Football

Frederick C. Gruninger (Rutgers University, New Brunswick): Mr. Chair, I move the adoption of Proposal No. 62.

[The motion was seconded.]

This will not be as lengthy, and I don't think that it is as shaky either as when we talk about restoring the 30-95 concept. We have put it in for a good reason. We moved it to 25 because of some costs reductions. We have gone back to home plate, and I believe that it is proper for us to take football back to that 30-95. It is good and it continues to be a good financial move.

Robert E. Frederick (University of Kansas): I wish to speak in support of Proposal No. 62. As our colleague Cedric Dempsey said during the Presidents Commission National Forum yesterday, the cost cutting in regards to athletics grants should be broad-based and applied equally to all sports. As you recall in the 1987 Convention in San Diego, we reduced the number of initial grants in football from 30 to 25 and the number of grants in basketball from 15 to 13. Then in the special Convention in Dallas five months later, we restored the basketball grants to 15. In the 1988 Convention in Nashville, we voted to return to 30 initial grants in football for this academic year only. I urge you to vote to return football to 30 initial grants permanently. Then, as Mr. Dempsey suggested, we can objectively look sometime in the future at cost reduction.

[Proposal No. 62 (Page A-63) was defeated by Division I-A, 45-63.]

Maximum Awards—Division I-A, I-AA Football

James W. Lessig (Mid-American Athletic Conference): Mr. Chair, on behalf of the NCAA Council, I would like to move the adoption of Proposal No. 63-A.

[The motion was seconded.]

This proposal will permit a Division I-A member institution to

award athletically related aid for a football student-athlete for the first time and exempt such aid from the initial-grant limitation if the student-athlete has been in residence at the certifying institution for at least two academic years. As you know, such a student-athlete currently would have to count in both the initial and overall grant limitations. The adoption of this proposal would provide member institutions with an opportunity to reward a walk-on student-athlete without affecting its recruiting class.

It does not increase the initial allowable grants of 25. It does give the coach the opportunity to reward an athlete who has worked hard and is deserving of the grant after two years in the program without the coach worrying about his initial-grant limitations. Again, it does not increase the total-grant limit. This proposal was endorsed by the Division I Recruiting Committee. I urge your support of Proposal No. 63-A.

Roy Kramer (Vanderbilt University): I urge your consideration that while this sounds like a very noncontroversial issue that it opens an almost unlimited door for an institution that has an extremely large walk-on program to greatly benefit by this rule because no longer do you have to count that person in your initial grant. It does not permit a level playing field. I think it is important that you look at that. If that is a problem within your conference or the institutions you compete with, I think it is important that you understand the loophole this opens.

Mr. Lessig: I ask my good friend Roy Kramer how the field becomes unlevel if the grants remain at 95; and you can have only 95 in the program at one time, whether they are junior, freshman or whatever? All this does is to allow the coach to reward a young man who he is reluctant to reward now simply because it affects his initial grants. The 95 doesn't move. We are still playing with the same number of athletes under the grant.

Mr. Kramer: That is correct to a point; except that if you have 140 people or if you have that ability, what it does do is permit you to delay scholarshiping those individuals. Let me tell you if you gentlemen are not aware that there is a tremendous number of recruited walk-ons in this world who never get reported as recruited walk-ons; and at the point of their junior year, we suddenly now scholarship them with no concern about the initial limit. It gives us the chance to really operate with a squad of 120 to 125 by suddenly jumping the maximum limit at the time the individual becomes a junior. It opens a loophole that is potentially very dangerous.

[Proposal No. 63-A (Page A-64) was approved by Division I-A, 61-45. See Page A-65 for subsequent voting action.]

Recruiting Contacts—Division I-A Head Coach

John Benn (University of Tulsa): Mr. Chair, I move the adoption of Proposal No. 87.

[The motion was seconded.]

The purpose of this proposal is to permit the head coach to visit the

prospect one day of the calendar week at the prospect's educational institution during the applicable contact period. I would like to emphasize that it continues to limit the head coach to one visit in the prospect's home during the contact period. Head coaches who have not established the reputation through the years need more of an opportunity to become acquainted to prospects during the recruiting process. The current rule allows the assistant football coaches to have access to a high school on a one-day-per-calendar-week basis. Proposal 87 is designed to provide the head coach with the same opportunity. This proposal does not mean automatically an increase in recruiting expenses, because the head coach can be substituted for the assistant coach and there would be no increased cost. We are sensitive to the need to have the head coach on campus during the recruiting process, yet we also are sensitive to the needs and desires of younger head coaches in the recruiting process. I, therefore, ask for your support in the adoption of this proposal.

Dave Hart Jr. (East Carolina University): We just have hired a new football coach who is very energetic and has outstanding work ethics and is a person of high integrity. I think that in order for him to demonstrate those positive characteristics he needs the ability to do what he wants to do and that is out-work some of the more established older coaches who have earned the respect that he is yet to earn as a head coach. He needs the ability to display his positive image and energetic work ethic, which really parallels that of the university, in order for us to maximize our ability to recruit those same outstanding athletes that the more established coaches are recruiting.

[Proposal No. 87 (Page A-87) was defeated by Division I-A.]

Number of Contests—Division I-A

Frederick E. Gruninger (Rutgers University, New Brunswick): I would like to move the adoption of Proposal No. 126.

[The motion was seconded.]

Mr. Gruninger: I would like to move the adoption of Proposal No. 126-1.

[The motion was seconded.]

This proposal will allow the opportunity to add an extra game to the allowable-game schedule only once every four years and only if that game is played in a foreign country. The proposal provides a realistic opportunity for the sport of football, under the same restrictive of once every four years, that exists for other sports today. You don't have to adjust the traditional 11-game schedule to do this. This limited special opportunity promotes the American game of college football in the foreign countries and expands that educational opportunity for your team members.

Carl F. Ullrich (U.S. Military Academy): The opportunities for institutions to go abroad and to make this kind of commitment, obviously, would be a great experience for the student-athlete. I want to speak as someone who has been part of two of these games in the

last five years, one in Japan and one in Ireland, and say what a great experience it was for our young people. We missed three days of school. We took tutors and instructors with us, but the experience they had in experiencing another culture was great. I urge your support of amendment to amendment No. 126.

[Proposal No. 126—1 (Page A-112) was approved by Division I-A. See Page A-112 for subsequent voting action.]

[Proposal No. 126 (Page A-112) was approved by Division I-A, 67-41, as amended by No. 126—1. See Page A-112 for subsequent voting action.]

REVIEW OF PROPOSED AMENDMENTS

Mr. Witte: We do have an opportunity to at least do something in the nature of a round table in the balance of the time this morning. It might be useful, then, if any delegates with comments or questions about the items for this afternoon's agenda would make those comments or ask those questions now.

Presidents Commission Grouping

Michael Swartz (Kent State University): Mr. Chair, at the meeting of the Division I presidents of the Presidents Commission, I was asked to inform this group that they would hope that Proposal No. 41, as well as Proposal No. 42, not be passed and ask instead for much more time for Bylaw 5-1-(j) to exist as it is in order that the organization may have more experience with it than it has at this time.

Corey Johnson (California State University, Long Beach): I would like to address Proposal No. 43. This is not an attempt to modify Bylaw 5-1-(j). I think it is important that the delegates recognize the distinction that is involved here. No. 43 does not deal with initial eligibility. It is designed as a mechanism to provide an incentive for those student-athletes who have lost the year of eligibility, either as nonqualifiers or as partial qualifiers, to complete their degrees and to stay in school and to finish the degrees that they have started. It does this by establishing an incentive of being able to gain back the lost year of eligibility, but only under carefully defined circumstances. The student-athlete must have made satisfactory progress during each of the four years of enrollment, the mandatory residency year at the beginning and then the three years of eligibility that are provided.

So, at the end of eight semesters that student-athlete will have completed a minimum of 96 semester units or 144 quarter units and thus be within one year of completing the degree. We have incorporated in this proposal the initial idea that the administration of the legislation be conducted by the member conferences or the NCAA Academic Requirements Committee, thus handling this very much the way we do hardship under the present regulations.

The argument in favor of this change is basically twofold. First, we are dealing with a group of student-athletes who tend not to be successful during their careers, either in high school or in college.

What this proposal does is say to these kids that as we have recruited you in the first place as a promising athlete, and perhaps a risk as a student. If you have continued to make progress as a student, we will continue to use the incentive of athletics participation to help keep you in school to the completion of the degree. As I think most people are aware, the student-athletes who have not been eligible under "Prop 48" primarily are from inner-city neighborhoods, mostly from very poor economic backgrounds, mostly the first kids in their family and the first generation in their family to attend college; and all of these things can affect the scores that young people get on the SAT or the ACT. What this legislation makes possible is for those kids, if they continue to make academic progress for eight semesters and thus have been able to show that the low scores they originally achieved were not an accurate predictor of success in college, those kids by their performance in the classroom have earned a year of eligibility.

I would note that also there will be an amendment made to this piece of legislation. After the discussion with the NCAA staff, we will introduce an amendment that will change the phrase "calendar year" to "academic year" to emphasize the fact that what we are dealing with here is a determination that can be made only at one point in the student-athlete's career—between the eighth and the ninth semester—so that the student-athlete in question has to be on course to complete the degree within five years in order to benefit from this legislation. Thank you.

Jerry Kingston (Arizona State University): Mr. Chair, I would like to speak in opposition to Proposal No. 43. The previous speaker correctly pointed out that it does contain positive incentive for student-athletes after they have entered a Division I school. I believe, however, it also contains some very negative incentives and sends the wrong signal to high school students: that there is an alternative, there is another way. They can hang out and hope; and possibly, they will be one of the few that will be able to work through and perhaps regain that fourth year of eligibility.

I also believe that it sends the wrong message to our recruiters who say, yes, we should continue to recruit nonqualifiers because they will dangle in front of those students the possibility that, sure, you can do it, too. I think this is bad legislation. I disagree with the previous speaker. I think it does undermine the intended purposes of 5-1-(j) legislation.

Randall G. Hoffman (San Jose State University): I would like to speak in favor of this piece of legislation. I don't agree with the previous speaker that it sends a wrong message to the high school and junior high school and to other groups. I think part of this legislation is to look seriously at encouragement to our student-athletes to graduate. This Association is not known for its awards and incentives and ways to promote the right legislation. I think this is an opportunity for us to look at an avenue here to encourage student-athletes to make progress. I think that the interpretation that might be sent down to any high school will be looked at very

closely. I think that there should be some legislation offered by this organization that hopefully is to encourage.

Barry A. Kinsey (University of Tulsa): I would like to make a couple of points in opposition to this proposal. The first point I would like to make is very simply that we have 5-1-(j) in place. The NCAA is known for changing its rules and often criticized for moving from one rule to another. The advantage of 5-1-(j) now as it is, is that it is at least out there. The people know what it is. The high school students know it; and the message is out. If we change it, we disturb that pattern. I think at least we ought to allow the system to work a while and get some stability. That is my first major reason for opposing this change. I don't want to see any change of 5-1-(j) right now. I think it is premature.

Secondly, I find no quality standards in this particular proposal. It simply says that we have to pass a certain number of hours. There is no specified grade-point average. There is no requirement that they make a certain type or level of performance. That would be up to each individual institution or conference to make that judgment. I am not sure that I think that is a good idea. I certainly think we send the wrong messages to the coaches. I also can see a situation where I see the circumstance of whether we will get a lot of pressure on the student-athletes to take their majors and perform in certain ways in order to gain back their eligibility. I think 5-1-(j) is fine the way it is, and people don't have to administer it. The student-athletes at high school know how and what their expectations are. I think it is premature to change it at this point.

Mr. Witte: If that concludes discussion on Proposal 43, we might go on to Proposal 44. That is dealing with junior college transfers and nonqualifiers.

John E. Nowak (University of Illinois, Champaign): As you can see from the program, the sponsorship for No. 44 spans a variety of conferences and independent schools and was done on the basis of all those schools and conferences feeling that this was a necessary component, making the so-called Proposition 48 requirements effective. Right now, the current system puts a high premium on going to junior college rather than to a Division I institution. Right now, the student that goes to Division I has only three years of eligibility in competition; whereas, the student who goes to junior college has the opportunity for four. This proposal would not prohibit the junior college nonqualifier from receiving a grant for financial aid during his first year after transfer. The key thing to remember is that if you had a nonqualifier or partial qualifier under this proposal, that when they transfer to the Division I institution, this student is allowed to receive aid, this student is allowed to practice, this student is merely kept from competing for one year.

It is a kind of required redshirt year. It is not intended to say that the junior college cannot prepare people to graduate. It is based only on these statistical certainties that a student from a junior college, who was not a full qualifier when he or she went to the junior college,

is highly unlikely, probably as a matter of personal choice, to graduate if the student uses the two remaining years of competitive eligibility immediately after transfer. If people are interested in graduation rates, this will help. And, in fact, this does not cost more money because of the student staying a semester or two in this last year to graduate. The amount of expenditure on financial aid would be the same. So, we believe that it is an important corollary to Proposition 48 and we hope that you will consider it.

Academics

Carl F. Ullrich (U.S. Military Academy): Can anybody tell me whether the Academic Requirements Committee is opposed to Proposal Nos. 52 and 53? I was told that was the case.

Mr. Witte: Yes. If you wish, I will read you the minutes from the committee that respond to your question. "The committee opposed adjustments of Bylaw 5-1-(j) before evaluation can be made of its effectiveness. This position deals with Proposal Nos. 42, 43, 44, 52, 53 and 54. The committee plans to review preliminary data now being gathered and to monitor closely the progress of student-athletes entering the member institutions in 1986 and the following years. In the interim, the committee recommends that all legislation already in the bylaw be tabled. It also was observed that NCAA academic standards are sometimes more restrictive than the academic standards applied to the student-nonathletes."

Mr. Ullrich: The U.S. Military Academy is for academic progress despite some of the comments a year ago. We are not only for it, but we require it. I am just hopeful that before anything is passed along this line that there will be some way to compute those grade-point averages, to do it fairly institution-to-institution, if the membership feels that this has to be taken out of the individual institution's hands.

The way it is done now is not fair. It is not fair to rate a person on a grade-point average who is taking 21 or 22 credit hours in one particular sort of a curriculum to someone who is taking 12 in another and say who is eligible or ineligible on the basis of those results. If we can come up with some way to do it fairly, then we are in favor of it. Right now, we are not despite the fact that we are very serious about academic progress.

Financial Aid

Margie McDonald (High Country Athletic Conference): Mr. Chair, I urge support of No. 65. Along with football, women's volleyball is a head-count sport and its traditional season is in the fall. It is not a traditional spring sport. This proposal would retain the 12 head-count limit for women's volleyball and allow an institution to maintain 12 athletes on grants-in-aid from both the traditional and the nontraditional season. Presently if an athlete has a good year, her grant-in-aid may not be passed to another student-athlete in volleyball without counting as an additional award in that academic year. In essence, it reduces the squad size of the nontraditional season. If No.

65 passes, the institution is given the option to replace that scholarship athlete without counting the aid twice in the same academic year; and the institution has that same option in the sport of football. So, I urge you to support Proposition 65.

Presidents Commission Grouping

Thomas C. Hansen (Pacific-10 Conference): Proposal No. 48 is an opportunity to try to help expedite the business of the Convention. I would like to call to the attention of the delegates the amendment to amendment for No. 48. No. 48 deals with the annual legislative calendar. I thought it might be helpful to call to your attention to an option that the delegates will enjoy here. We support the move to the protracted legislative calendar, but we felt that the date was a little early. As you will see in the second amendment, so did the Air Force Academy as well as the CFA. First, in No. 48, we proposed that there be eight sponsors instead of 10 to eliminate the new criteria that they all be from one conference. If it is a five-and-five situation, conferences merely will trade sponsorship agreements; and you really are not going to do anything except complicate the matter. So, we propose that it be eight.

Then the Air Force proposal moves the Council's proposed date of April 15 to July 1. This would be voted on first before No. 48-3, which could change that date to June 1. We felt that the June 1 date would give more conferences the chance to generate discussion in the spring meeting. The CFA felt we should go one further step and give the NACDA meeting and other conferences an opportunity to generate legislation before the deadline.

With No. 48-4, we felt it was a must for the Council to be able during the course of the Convention to add clean-up amendments, because there repeatedly are occasions where not until we get here and begin these discussions do we see a flaw in a proposal that would be fatal to its consideration and passage and would mean that without the Council's ability to do this we would lose a year in enacting legislation that might be quite beneficial. So, those are the options that you have in that.

Col. John J. Clune (U.S. Air Force Academy): I would like to say we are looking for the 1 July date for two reasons. First, the National Association of Collegiate Directors of Athletics always meets the first week in June. That meeting is attended also by and in conjunction with the Division I-A Football Athletics Directors meeting; and so many times, the legislation that may come up to be discussed could be discussed at that point and still be submitted by the July 1 date. The 1 June date would negate that. Also the College Football Association meets the first part of June; and that is a unique setting in that not only are the athletics directors there, but the football coaches, chief executive officers, as well as faculty reps. Legislation has to come out of those meetings. Therefore, the 1 July date allows those associations and subsets to put in legislation by the July date. I urge you voting members to consider that in the proposal.

Mr. Witte: I feel that it is necessary to note for the record that Nos. 48-4 and 48-5 have been sponsored by the Council and that No. 48-4 also is sponsored by the Pacific-10 Conference. I believe that the rationale for these amendments is to permit the Council to act on what are essentially last-minute or emergency situations that are necessary in order to save otherwise valuable amendments. This would not work any change in our existing procedure and merely codify what has been the practice.

Playing Seasons

Jerry A. Miles (American Baseball Coaches Association): I would like to go back to No. 131. I think all of us are looking for programs that will meet the terminology that ought to be used in the activities they truly enjoy. This rule, at best, undoubtedly will cut deep in to one of our country's outstanding programs for youngsters; and that is organized summer baseball leagues, which are not a cost to the institutions. Summer-league baseball is a tradition for American kids of all ages. Ladies and gentlemen, make no mistake. If the membership doesn't pass No. 131, which will allow the coach to coach a team with a player or players at these institutions, the summer-league baseball programs will be hurt, which means the youngsters once again will pay the price for over legislating. There was little, if any, abuse incurred when summer baseball teams were coached by players from their institutions. Let's don't penalize baseball and thousands of youngsters for abuses of others. On behalf of the American Baseball Coaches Association, I would strongly urge your support of Proposal No. 131.

[The Division I-A business session was adjourned at 10:30 a.m.]

Division I-AA Business Session

Tuesday Morning, January 10, 1989

The Division I-AA business session was called to order at 9 a.m., with Charlotte West, Southern Illinois University, Carbondale, presiding.

Ms. West: If everyone can be seated, we will start the session. Good morning. Welcome to the Division I-AA business session.

Let me introduce to you the other members of the Council that are from member institutions in I-AA. These five people and myself represent you on the NCAA Council. We do our best to represent the interests of Division I-AA.

[NOTE: Division I-AA members of the NCAA Council were introduced, announcements were made, Convention publications were reviewed and the voting procedures were explained.]

PROPOSED AMENDMENTS

Thurston E. Banks (Tennessee Technological University): On behalf of the Council, I would like to move adoption of Proposal No. 63-B.

[The motion was seconded.]

This proposal would permit Division I-AA member institutions to award athletically related financial aid to a football student-athlete for the first time and exempt such aid from the initial-grant limitations if the student-athlete has been in residence at the certifying institution for at least two academic years. As you know, such a student-athlete currently would have to count in both the initial- and overall-grant limitations. The adoption of this proposal would provide member institutions with the opportunity to reward walk-on athletes without affecting its freshman-recruiting class. I urge your support of this proposal.

[Proposal No. 63-B (Page A-63) was approved by Division I-AA.]

REVIEW OF PROPOSED AMENDMENTS

Ms. West: We do have sufficient time, obviously, for discussion of any of the proposals that will be handled this afternoon in the Division I business session.

[NOTE: By straw votes, Division I-AA delegates indicated their approval of Proposal Nos. 43, 65, 88, 131 and 133; disapproval of Nos. 42, 44, 53, 52 and 120, with no clear indication on No. 99.]

Edward B. Fort (North Carolina A&T State University): If you would turn to the amendments-to-the-amendments sheet, you will denote our university's posture with regard to the resolution on Division I Men's Basketball Championship provisos. Before I give

my statement with respect to the six reasons why I am requesting support of my colleagues for this action, I would make this one comment. It seems rather odd that we have an unusual situation wherein this body is being asked to take away something that already has been won. It sort of reminds one of the gentleman 50 years ago who goes through the process of learning the Mississippi state constitution in English and when he gets to the polling site he is informed that, sorry, we have changed the rules. You now have to learn it in Chinese.

I view this legislation as nothing short of the promulgation of inequity; because once again, the NCAA finds itself upon the horns of a dilemma as associated with that issue. Now, the Division I Men's Basketball Committee, in recommending its change in the tournaments' provisos, is advocating openingly a system that will do nothing more than promulgate the disequilization of athletics opportunity for black schools in Division I basketball play. I say this for six reasons and on that basis express open opposition to the rule that will eliminate the automatic-qualifying berth for all Division I basketball leagues; because, if in fact the NCAA Council makes a decision to accept the Men's Basketball Committee recommendations, it will have perpetrated an injustice.

My six reasons are these: No. 1, unequal intradivisional treatment. Let me elaborate. At the present time, it is very difficult for historically black universities and colleges in Division I basketball to fulfill their Division I schedule commitments without the cooperation of I-A schools that are willing to play these campuses. We certainly cannot arrange a schedule that involves only intraleague play; and hence, a campus like North Carolina A&T State University must throw itself on the mercy of other I-A schools nationally that express a willingness to schedule our school in their arena. I find it rather odd that even when we are fortunate enough to get a "yes" response from those campuses, that the games are played on the home court of the I-A opposition schools only. We have never, during the past seven years of winning the league championship in basketball, been given the privilege of hosting a predominantly Caucasian university from, for example, the ACC on our campus. The arrangement always has been conversely a "sweetheart deal" involving our team playing their team on their home court. We have been willing to accept this implied denigration because of our sincere desire to ensure that our kids get a chance to play I-A basketball even if it involves playing with teams on their home courts only.

Opposition point No. 2: No black campuses in the pool. Once again, no historically black colleges and universities will share in the wealth as associated with first-round play in the NCAA. Now, it is no secret that our campus, for example, and our counterpart in the Southwestern Athletic Conference have made substantial gains during our seven consecutive winning seasons and the capture of the league tournaments. Our team, therefore, for the past seven years has gone automatically to the NCAA first-round play and with it has

come substantial income. Last year, for example, the institution captured in excess of \$200,000 just for playing in round one. Even after portions of that money were split off with the MEAC, we still had substantial amounts of money to be used for purposes of accommodating our projected athletics expenses for that year and beyond. With the elimination of that automatic-berth proviso in 1991, if the Council has its way, the chances of a black-college NCAA play-off appearance are slim and probably highly improbable. Hence, you have a situation where the "haves" are perpetuated and the "have nots" are given the signal to "stay back."

Point No. 3, in terms of my opposition, is what I call the West Texas scenario. The NCAA, and its basketball committee, has never forgotten really the experience involving that small Texas team—that is Texas Western—that came out of nowhere some 23 years ago. We all know what happened. The team fielded five black players; made the Final Four, and a week later the rest was history. It had won the NCAA championship. There are those who vowed that it would never happen again. Under these rules, they are right; it probably would not happen again.

Opposition point No. 4: The strength-of-schedule argument. You see, if you use strength of schedule as an argument, that legitimizes the selection, even though it is subjective. As I understand it, the strength of schedule rationale simply does not wash. It means, for example, that an historically black college and university team with a 30-0 record could end up not being selected to go, on an automatic-berth basis, to round one of the NCAA play-offs in basketball if, in fact, its league was not given that automatic berth. How could a team with a 30-0 record get the experience of playing majors if the majors are not willing to schedule it?

Point No. 5 in opposition: At least a play-off. The NCAA basketball committee, in seeking to justify its reasons for elimination of the bottom tier of schools from automatic-berth placement, suggests that if the current practice is continued, we shall eventually have a situation wherein 31 qualifiers would be vying for only 30 slots. I assume that is accurate because I picked this up in literature, also in the press reports. I say "nonsense." One only need use the rule of common sense to discern that the way out of the quagmire is asking the bottom two teams to play off.

Item No. 6 and finally: Why no play-off for the spots? If the NCAA Division I Men's Basketball Committee really is committed to the issue of equity, then at the very least it could rearrange its recommendations by suggesting that those teams in the bottom tenth of the teams vying for an automatic berth expose themselves to play-off competition. With the play-off results intact, it would then be possible to identify teams which, although not automatically provided with an opportunity for going to the first round of the NCAA leading to the Final Four, would, nonetheless, be given a chance to take a shot at the brass ring via pretournament play-off competition. And I am suggesting frankly that that might be the way out of this box canyon

as a compromise; insist that there be a pretournament play-off competition so that, in fact, if you are locked into 30 slots, you get them on that basis.

Conclusion: The bottom line, as I see it as the chancellor of the largest black campus in North Carolina, is quite simple. The NCAA committee has failed to uphold its responsibilities as associated with the issue of equity. I am not saying that it has done so deliberately; but it has done so on a factual basis. This rule, driven by whatever motives to the contrary notwithstanding, ultimately will result in the elimination of historically black campuses from automatic-berth competition. And that, all rules to the contrary notwithstanding, just simply will not wash.

And so, Madam Chair, on that basis, I would urge my colleagues of this distinguished gathering to support the position by North Carolina A&T State University and overturn the position taken by the NCAA Council in connection with the recommendations of the Men's Division I Basketball Committee.

Ms. West: You will note that No. 148 is a new resolution acceptable because the membership always has the opportunity to support or reverse the decision of the Council or the Executive Committee.

Jeffrey H. Orleans (Council of Ivy Group Presidents): I would like to speak briefly to Chancellor Fort's resolution from the perspective of one who has sat through a number of conversations of the University Commissioners Association of Divisions I-AA and I-AAA commissioners in attempting to influence both the basketball committee and the Executive Committee; and while I think I might have a slightly different perspective from the chancellor's, it comes out for the same place.

The UCA and the Collegiate Commissioners Association, the CCA, have urged on the Division I Men's Basketball Committee and the Executive Committee the last point that Chancellor Fort made. That is that there ought to be an opportunity for play-off between whatever conferences turn out to be the play-off conferences in order to be eligible for the last couple of automatic bids, once the numbers of eligible conferences exceeds the number of bids. That is really the issue here in practical terms. The votes of both of those commissioners groups in the fall were quite substantial. The UCA vote was unanimous, urging on the basketball committee that it recommend a play-off to the Executive Committee. The basketball committee did not recommend the play-off. It recommended instead that the selection of automatic-qualification conferences beginning in the 1991 tournament at the close of the season, the same weekend that at-large teams are selected, be based on a very complex and to my mind highly ambiguous set of scheduling procedures.

The Executive Committee has not accepted fully that recommendation. It has asked the basketball committee to once again solicit opinions from the membership about how one would construct these scheduling criteria. Those opinions are to be sent in in March and the Executive Committee is to then act in May. I would hope that all of us

in this room and all of us in Division I who are concerned about these criteria would get copies of them and would talk to our commissioners if you are members of conferences. Your commissioners who have been in the UCA meetings are able fully to discuss with you, if they have not already, these issues and to provide to the basketball committee your comments about these scheduling criteria.

It seems clear to me that it would be easier for the committee in the long run to administer these criteria so as to pick the conferences that have to playoff than it is to administer these criteria so as to pick the conferences that are either in or completely out. If we simply could urge on the basketball committee this position, we could avoid the very difficult position of having to overturn the action of a committee, which has acted in very good faith and which really has taken the opportunity to receive the memberships' opinions and which, nonetheless, in the opinion of many of us, is going to make a mistake.

I simply would add that if Chancellor Fort's resolution does go to the floor and does not pass today, I am concerned that the basketball committee or the Executive Committee will feel relieved of the responsibility to consider this issue further. So I think it is imperative that if there is a vote in Division I, that even though none of us wishes to put a sport committee in a difficult position of being overturned on something like this, that we make clear that we are not satisfied with the tentative recommendations of the basketball committee; and if asked to do so, we tell the basketball committee that we want it to consider changing its mind.

Frederick S. Humphries (Florida A&M University): I would like to speak on behalf of Chancellor Fort's resolution, and I would like to offer the following thoughts as to why this body should support Chancellor Fort's resolution. There is trouble and troublesome concerns in Division I, which consists of Divisions I-A, I-AA and I-AAA. My understanding of why this issue is before us in the first place is because there are other schools that are contemplating forming conferences and coming into Division I, obviously to share in the championship revenue generated by basketball. So very typically, the response of the basketball committee and the Executive Committee and the Council is to be protective of Division I in terms of the present income that they are, in fact, earning via that mechanism.

I would like to examine the logic of the protection of income with you. I do not know why Division I-AA, which now has all of its conferences participating in the basketball tournament, should readily accede to a notion that its income does not need to be protected. This troubling division in the NCAA already is faced with a task force that is looking at reorganization of the NCAA. And I need not remind you that the group that is going to be most affected by a reorganization is Division I-AA.

Now, you have heard suggested by the speakers the last two days that some teams in Division I ought to be moved down to Division II and some teams in Division III ought to be moved up to Division II to create a much stronger Division II. This whole notion of reorganization

is based on the principle that there are some weak sisters—sorry—there are some weak teams (laughter) in Division I-AA that ought to be moved down. And I see this action as the beginning of that development. I do not know why anyone should ask us in Division I-AA to be less concerned about economics than someone in Division I-A, because the driving force of this resolution is to be protective of Division I-A.

The second point that I would like to argue with this body and ask that you give some real common-sense thought to is this: We have 64 slots in the basketball tournament. Why is it not the privilege of every conference to have one guaranteed slot? What possible reason could you have for not including every conference, which is the mainstay of this organization. Conferences are encouraged in the NCAA, because they are another mechanism by which we have a better handle on integrity and more responsible rule making. So, what we are saying is that independents and other teams in the tournament are more important than conferences. I think that is illogical. I think that the one thing that ought to be sacred in the selections for the basketball tournament and championship play is the conferences and that we are not ever to worry about whether a conference has a berth in the championship play-off.

What we are talking about here is 64 slots, 32 conferences; and we all want to guarantee every one of those conferences a spot in the play-off. What possible reason could there be for not allowing a conference to have a berth in the NCAA championship? Now, let us look at the makeup of the NCAA championship play-off. All of you know that there will be four and five teams from the same conference and a lot of independent schools selected in the at-large berths to participate in the tournament. Why should we roll over and allow them to take all the money out of the basketball tournament? It seems to me that we ought to be talking about a rule that first of all guarantees to the top team in the conference one slot and then a rotating rule that goes down to two for the second team to be included in the championship play-off before allowing five teams from one conference to participate in the national championship. Why should not we be accommodating that? (Applause)

If we say that athletics—I mean, this is what we preach and this is what everybody talks about—teach teamwork, subordination of individual merit to that of a team, then we get on the floor of this Convention and violate every principle we talk about in terms of teamwork, in terms of athletics, in terms of our business decisions. We violate every principle that we espouse as the important qualities and characteristics of team play. And I think it is time to call that to an end. I have been surprised at us. Division I-AA has to become more aggressive and better fighters. We buy into this argument all the time. We have to protect Division I-A's interests. Well, what about our interests? We are institutions that are full members of this organization, and our concerns and our welfare ought to be at the uppermost. If we are talking about team spirit and team play, we

should subordinate the avarice of the leaders to the good of the whole, which is the quality we talk about in teamwork but seldom display.

The only reason that we have this thing before us now to vote on is because we want to be protective of the teams that already have been sharing unevenly in the basketball play-off. So what if we put it up for grabs. You say that we play some weak teams that are playing in the championship, and we never get past the first round. Well, what is the whole thing of athletics? It is to get out there and participate and compete. We want to destroy everything that allows a person to aspire and be creative. I mean we are in this family as an aspiring institution. I aspire. I want to compete. I am not there yet, but I will get there. I have the fighting spirit in me, which is what we are supposed to be talking about. I do not want to be conquered by some pedestrian rules. And that is what we are getting ready to do.

That is not the name of the game. The name of the game is competing, to get out there and compete and allow people to dream and have aspirations about winning the championship. That is not the purview of only a few people. That should be a guaranteed right for all of us by being in Division I, and I do not see that we should give that up so easily. They may get the MEAC and they may get the SWAC; but I can guarantee you the next time they are going to be coming for you. It does not end with that. Okay? (Applause) So I am urging you vote this down.

And one other point and I am going to be through. If we were dealing on the other side and not in athletics, if we were dealing with the Federal government, let me just tell you: The presidents of all of these institutions would not stand still for one minute to talk about a rule that would exclude people who already are included. They would not stand still one minute for that. And I am telling you that they would insist on being "grandfathered" in. The new people would have to meet the criteria. You do that in your state-level organizations dealing with higher education. If somebody tried to create a rule that would put you out for something that you are entitled to now, the first thing you would do is ask that you be grandfathered in and then the new folks that are coming in would have to meet this newer, higher criteria. Well, I think that for athletics—and that is what we do—it should be the same rule. If there are 32 conferences getting automatic bids and we want to talk about changing the rules, then we ought to at least, at the minimum, insist that the 32 conferences be protected, that they be grandfathered in. If there are new conferences that are being developed, those conferences have to meet the higher criteria. But we ought not to be voting on something that is going to cause this membership to be lessened in the process of competition in this organization. Thank you. (Applause)

Ms. West: Is there any other business before us in I-AA?

Don Landry (Southland Conference): I would like to call your attention to Proposal No. 103. We are proposing this rule to try to help our football staffs on a problem during recruiting, primarily when we have recruiting weekends that bring a lot of prospects in at one time.

Currently graduate assistants and part-time coaches can help out in the transportation of prospects visiting your campus by helping pick them up at bus stations, train stations or the major airport nearest your campus. However, if some prospects did not have transportation, these part-time coaches or graduate assistants are not allowed to pick them up at their home or at their school to bring them to your campus.

We are asking for a little relief in football only because it appears that football has the biggest problem because of the nature of the recruiting. We are asking for some relief so that we could use part-time coaches and graduate assistants to help transport prospects to the campus. One concern we have had is that we are putting some people on the road, who maybe are not as familiar with the recruiting rules as full-time coaches, to pick up these prospects. However, the current rules already allow us to do that, to pick them up at the airport. Division I-AA football staffs are smaller than I-A. It puts a real hardship on the number of coaches. Also, many of the I-AA conferences are not located at metropolitan areas where we are flying in a lot of prospects. They have to either drive in on their own or we have to help pick them up. But we think it is just a rule that would help all of us in I-AA, and we will ask for your consideration when this comes before the governing body.

[The Division I-AA business session was adjourned at 9:23 a.m.]

■ Division I-AAA Business Session

Tuesday Morning, January 10, 1989

The Division I-AAA business session was convened at 9 a.m. by Kathleen M. McNally, La Salle University, chair.

[Note: Because no votes were taken in the session, the following is a summary of the discussion. Only discussion of a significant nature concerning the proposed amendments is summarized. A verbatim transcript is on file in the Association's national office.]

OPENING REMARKS

Chair McNally announced the proposals to be voted on at the afternoon Division I business session, those that would be withdrawn and those that had amendments to the amendment. She indicated that the delegates were free to discuss any of the proposals.

REVIEW OF PROPOSED AMENDMENTS

Presidents Commission Grouping

There was lengthy discussion of Proposal No. 43, which would permit nonqualifiers or partial qualifiers in Division I to earn a fourth season of athletics eligibility, provided they have completed 96 semester or 144 quarter units toward a specific degree by the beginning of fifth academic year following their initial, full-time enrollment. Proponents argued that the proposal would provide an incentive for student-athletes who were academically vulnerable when they entered college to work hard to regain a fourth year of competition and, thus, enhance the academic welfare for those denied eligibility their first year because of failure to comply with Bylaw 5-1-(j).

Opponents argued that passage of the proposal would send the wrong message to high school students that even if they did not work hard in high school, they still could compete for four years in college. Also, it was pointed out that the Presidents Commission was opposed to any legislation that would affect Bylaw 5-1-(j) until a study undertaken by the Commission could evaluate the effects of the bylaw.

A straw vote indicated that Division I-AAA delegates were not in favor of the proposal.

Membership and Classification

Proposal No. 122, which would permit a one-year probationary period for institutions failing to meet the minimum sports sponsorship criteria for their respective divisions once in every 10-year period, also was discussed. The most significant objection to the proposal and to Proposal No. 122—1 was that institutions might "bounce" in

and out of the probationary status without falling into the restricted membership category. No straw vote was taken on the two proposals.

Playing Seasons

The only other proposal that was discussed was No. 131, which would limit the application of the 26-week playing-season limitation in Division I baseball to the academic year. Proponents argued that the limitation jeopardized summer baseball programs to the extent that a baseball coach could not coach a summer program team if one of his players was on that team.

A straw vote indicated that Division I-AAA delegates were in favor of the proposal.

[The Division I-AAA business session was adjourned at 9:40 a.m.]

Division II Business Session

Tuesday Morning, January 10, 1989

The meeting was called to order at 9 a.m., by Howard Elwell, Gannon University, Division II vice-president.

Mr. Elwell: I am Bud Elwell, director of athletics at Gannon University and Division II vice-president; and obviously, this is the Division II business session of the NCAA Convention. I would like to make some introductions and some announcements.

[Note: Members of the Division II Steering Committee were introduced, and the Convention publications and voting procedures were reviewed.]

REVIEW OF PROPOSED AMENDMENTS

Consent Packages

Ronald J. Petro (University of Alaska, Anchorage): If you will look in your booklets, you will see that we have three different consent packages: Nos. 1 through 9, 10 through 34, and 35 through 38. One has to do with the constitution, the second with bylaws, and the third with deregulation and simplification. These are considered noncontroversial and housekeeping in nature. If there is any objection or anyone wants to pull them out, they can be pulled out and voted on separately. Two notes: There is an amendment to No. 16, which you should be able to pick up with the amendment folder; and No. 21 is going to be withdrawn by the Council. I don't think it's necessary to go over these basically noncontroversial proposals.

Presidents Commission Grouping

James B. Appleberry (Northern Michigan University): Just a couple of brief notes. I know that many of you received a communication from various members of the Presidents Commission prior to this meeting. As a result of a number of comments that were presented to the Presidents Commission members and its leadership, Proposal No. 39 was withdrawn; and in its place, the Presidents Commission has developed a resolution, which it hopes to vote on at the same time in the agenda as the former Proposal No. 39. Just for your information, with regard to the Proposition 39 content and the procedures that resulted in discussion by the Presidents Commission, let me give you a couple of bits of information about the future if the resolution is approved. The Division II members of the Presidents Commission made these comments with regard to the substance of the proposition. No. 39 does not address the question of foreign students or international students. If the study committee is supported as indicated in the resolution, we would like to have that addressed by

the cost-containment committee. A second comment we made is that if the cost-containment committee is approved, we think that Division II needs a better data base on the opinions and concerns of Division II schools before there are any presentations to the NCAA committee. And we will try to monitor that and, hopefully, will keep you informed about the progress and the opinions we are getting for Division II schools.

We also said that in the original Proposal No. 39, a number of Division II schools had expressed concern to us about the exemption of specific sports from any direction or move toward need-base aid. It was the indication or statement of the Presidents Commission members from Division II that we think that any exclusion of any one sport ought to be considered very carefully. In fact, we said we don't think any should be excluded if we are going to move forward to need-base aid; it needs to be for all sports. The other comments we made back to the full Presidents Commission was that we saw no problems in the original proposal with regard to the cost-of-attendance definition and we saw no problem with moving to division autonomy in terms of determining financial aid.

The reason why I'm being so complete and specific in giving you information about our comments back to the full Presidents Commission is because of one of the comments I made a minute ago. We need to know how Division II schools view these matters. You need to know what we are saying back to the Presidents Commission; and if there are specific comments that you need to make to the Division II representatives on the Presidents Commission, we need for you to let us know, to make sure that we are working hand in glove with you as these matters move forward. With that, we did support the withdrawal of Proposal No. 39, and we do support the substitute resolution that will be coming before the full Commission.

Kent Wyatt (Delta State University): The resolution that will replace No. 39 will allow NCAA President Wil Bailey to appoint a committee with certain guidelines established that you see there before you, and that committee will study cost containment and then report back to our Convention sometime between now and 1991.

We will move to Proposal No. 40. No. 40 is a divided bylaw and a divided vote, so Division II could vote this in or vote it out and Division I could do the same thing. I want to tell you that even though this is Council sponsored, your steering committee opposed this and still opposes the passage of Proposal No. 40 in Division II.

James B. Appleberry (Northern Michigan University): The Presidents Commission members from Division II think that this should either be withdrawn, referred or tabled until the report of the cost-containment committee, if it is established by resolution, reports to the full NCAA. Failing that, if it is not withdrawn, referred, or tabled, then we think that it should be rejected. The reasons are because No. 1, there is a potential question regarding misuse of funds based on these data if this is proposed. We think that this is sufficiently unclear and could get institutions in trouble the way it's

written. No. 2, we think that there is a potential for increased costs to the institutions and the students if it's adopted in its present format. So we are encouraging a no vote if it proceeds to a full vote.

Kent Wyatt (Delta State University): Moving on to the next issues. Several of the next ones in the Presidents Commission grouping are Division I or Division III issues only, but I will give you the information that the Council has received pertaining to some of these.

We understand that Division I members of the Council were going to oppose No. 41, but it is to be withdrawn. If for some reason No. 41 is not withdrawn and if 41 passes, 42 would be moot. No. 43 has an amendment. The amendment would simply change the wording that says "calendar year" to "academic year." And, No. 43 is also a Division I only piece of legislation. No. 44 is a Division I only piece of legislation. No. 45 is for Division III only. Division III Steering Committee opposes this, and we understand that it will be withdrawn. No. 46 is a Division III amendment only. The way I understand it, the Division III Steering Committee opposes this. If for some reason No. 45 were to pass, No. 46 would be moot. That brings us to No. 47. This is a Council-sponsored amendment, and the Council is going to withdraw Proposal No. 47.

That moves us to the amendment, No. 48, that might cause some discussion. You can see before you that there are several amendments to the amendment. Proposal No. 48 was recommended to the Council by our special subcommittee on the incorporation of interpretations of legislation in the NCAA Manual. What this does primarily is change the dates that amendments and resolutions would be filed with the NCAA office, and it also would change the number of sponsors that an amendment would have to have.

Resolutions would have to be submitted to the Council office by October 15, amendments by April 15. They would then be published by May 15 in *The NCAA News*. The Council, steering committees and the Presidents Commission would have to submit theirs by August 15. By September 15, the Council, division steering committees and the Presidents Commission amendments would be published in *The NCAA News*; and by November 15, copies of amendments will be mailed to the membership. This would give us significantly more lead time to look at all the pieces of legislation that come to the Council and to the NCAA office, so that the Council can evaluate them and make any suggestions or any changes that need to be made prior to coming to this Convention.

Now, with that in mind, let's move then to No. 48—1 and see what that amendment does. As I said, one facet of this was the number of sponsoring institutions. Now, six institutions may sponsor an amendment. This new change would require 10 sponsors, no more than five from any one conference. So it wouldn't be a particular piece of legislation that would be applicable only to one conference and a few institutions. It would require at least two conferences and at least 10 institutions to sign off on the amendments. No. 48—1 would

change that so that it would require only eight active members, and they could all be from the same conference. All that simply would do would be change what we have now at six to eight.

Nos. 48—2 and 48—3 are identical in that they move the April 15th date that the original amendment proposed. They move it back to July the first, or June the first. Amendment to amendment 48—2 moves it to July the first, and 48—3 moves it to June the first. If you pass Amendment No. 48—2, then No. 48—3 would be moot.

We will move on to No. 48—4. At the present time, the Council has a window of opportunity to introduce amendments to amendments right up to the day of the NCAA Convention. If there is something that needs to be adjusted, the Council can do that by a two-thirds vote. No. 48—4 reinstates that opportunity for the Council. If the Council, on a two-thirds vote, sees that there is some adjustment that needs to be made right before the Convention, it would have that window of opportunity to offer that amendment for your consideration.

No. 48—5 does the exact same thing for resolutions, simply gives the Council that opportunity on a two-thirds vote to bring something to you after the deadlines have passed.

PROPOSED AMENDMENTS

Initial Eligibility—Standardized Testing Deadline

Raymond M. Burse (Kentucky State University): On behalf of the NCA Council and Division II Steering Committee, I move the adoption of Proposal No. 49-B.

[The motion was seconded.]

This proposal would replace the current July 1 deadline date for meeting the minimum required SAT or ACT score in order to be a qualifier under Bylaw 5-1-(j) with a requirement that the test score must be completed prior to the individual's first enrollment in a collegiate institution. The purpose of the proposal is to make it possible for the student-athlete who initially enrolled in a collegiate institution in midyear to utilize a test score from a test taken after July 1, but prior to enrollment to meet the standards to be considered for a qualifier. It should be noted that this legislation does not change the requirement that the test score must be accomplished on a national testing day. I urge your support of this proposal.

[Proposal No. 49-B (Page A-50) was approved by Division II.]

REVIEW OF PROPOSED AMENDMENTS

Academics

Sandra T. Shuler (North Carolina Central University): Proposal No. 50 is intended to certify the eligibility of prospective student-athletes based on a cumulative GPA of at least 3.000 on a 4.000 scale. A combined SAT score of at least 1,000 or composite ACT score of 23 or more. This proposal also would eliminate the core-curriculum requirement and certification through the use of Forms 48-C and H. There is an amendment to Proposal No. 51, which is more consistent with the intent of the sponsors. This amendment would

establish approval for a study to determine the feasibility of a clearing house to certify the eligibility of all prospective student-athletes in terms of meeting the core-curriculum requirement and achieving the test scores, as well as certification of graduation from high school. The amendment calls for three college admission officers or registrars to serve on the committee and two secondary principals. This study is estimated to cost \$15,000, and the findings are to be reported to the Division I and Division II membership at the 1990 Convention.

Proposal No. 52 is Division I only. So is Proposal No. 53, which establishes a GPA scale that we adopted in Division II last year. Proposal No. 54 is satisfactory-progress legislation, and its intent is to increase the minimum number of credit hours a student must earn subsequent to his first year or after a one-year season of participation. It still requires 24 semester credit hours to begin a second year of competition, but it increases from 48 to 51 credit hours to begin the third year of competition. The Division II Steering Committee opposed this proposal, as did the Council because right now, we are looking at more stringent requirements for our student-athletes than some of our regular students. No. 55 is a resolution from the National Association of Academic Advisors for Athletics.

John A. Hogan (Colorado School of Mines): As chair of the Faculty Athletics Representatives Association and of our Academic Review Committee, I would like to read the Academic Review Committee response to Proposal No. 55: "The committee applauds all worthy contributions of academic advisors for athletics. However, it notes that such advisors are not members of an institution's teaching faculty and that generally such advisors are employed by an institution's athletics department. As such, they are not the appropriate persons to represent an institution on academically oriented legislative matters in NCAA governance. The committee affirms that the academic interest of both the student-athlete and an institution of higher education are best served in NCAA deliberations by persons who hold faculty appointments and who are employed separately from an athletics department. The faculty representatives urge the defeat of 55."

G. Lynn Lashbrook (University of Alaska, Fairbanks): It's my understanding that No. 55 has been withdrawn. I just want the membership to understand the intent of the resolution. The sponsorship was only to seek recognition and to let the NCAA know that we have a tremendous amount of resource in the people that are academic advisors; there are over 450 members. And there is a concern that there are people in the NCAA membership who are available to be on committees and that have a tremendous amount of expertise. And there was a concern that the faculty reps, when they made their remark, did not recognize that over half, I think, of our members are employed by the academic community and not by the athletics community. I just want to assure everybody that the intent of the resolution was only to seek recognition and let the NCAA members

know that we have a tremendous resource available.

Mr. Elwell: I think the position of the Council is such that being a member of NAAAA obviously does not exclude you from consideration on any Council-appointed committee and so on. You obviously still could be appointed, but you just couldn't represent that organization on a committee. Nor would that organization have slotted places on various committees such as the presidents, athletics directors and the senior women administrators do now.

Financial Aid

Marjorie A. Trout (Millersville University of Pennsylvania): No. 56 deals with financial aid limitations. This proposal would eliminate or exempt the following government grants in computing the total cost of attendance: the GI Bill of Rights; ROTC; National Guard; War Orphans Educational Programs; Social Security Insurance Programs, as well as state government awards, if such awards are approved by a two-thirds vote of the Council. The Council took no action on this.

No. 57, also sponsored by the NCAA Council, would permit an athlete to receive financial aid for summer school prior to initial enrollment as a freshman. This would be summer school or an orientation program subject to a few regulations. They must be regularly admitted students. They will then be subject to the transfer rule, may not engage in out-of-season practice, and will be countable for aid whether they remain at the institution or transfer. This will be an all-division common vote.

No. 59 would exempt employment monies for student-athletes who have completed their playing eligibility the previous year, as long as they do not practice. And it does say "play," so we are assuming that means scrimmaging.

Under No. 60, Financial Aid Limitations—Tuition Waivers, tuition and fee waivers given to employees' children as part of an employment-benefit package would not count toward the maximum-award limitations. The Council has a concern with this because we feel that there may be some student-athletes employed at the universities at the colleges, so that the monies would be made available to them, and, therefore be exempt. So the Council does not support it.

R. Bruce Allison (Colorado School of Mines): I would like, if I may on behalf of the steering committee and Council, to point out to the membership that perhaps at first glance this does seem like a good piece of legislation. Those institutions that do provide faculty benefits in terms of tuition remission at other schools or perhaps at their own school is a very good thing. However, I am reminded that on our campus, and I suspect several others, when you get into staff membership, we have a high turnover rate. And it would be probably, if this legislation were to pass, I would expect that there would be a number of institutions that would have a five-year turnover rate of staff.

Ms. Trout: Proposal Nos. 61, 62, 63, 64 and 65 are not Division II

proposals.

PROPOSED AMENDMENTS

Maximum Awards—Division II Football

George M. MacDonald (Grand Valley State University): I move the adoption of Proposal No. 66.

[The motion was seconded.]

This proposal was passed last year and then was brought back to the floor. The main reason that the Great Lakes Intercollegiate Athletic Conference and the Heartland Collegiate Conference have put this proposal forward is to equalize competition within Division II. We have situations where we have schools with at least as low as 10 scholarships and up to 40. That's basically the situation throughout Division II. Our concern is that schools with low numbers of scholarships have no hope to compete for a national championship. We feel that if we would be able to reduce the present 40 to 35, that there would be a greater opportunity for equalization of competition.

We also feel that each individual school would then reallocate their resources to other situations. My school presently has 40 football scholarships. We have 15 sports, only six of those sports are scholarship sports. I feel that this is an opportunity for schools, such as ourselves, to reallocate some of those additional five scholarships to other sports or put it into an operating scholarship. Also, if that was not involved, a cost-containment and cost-reduction situation could be worked out in each of the different schools. I do know that Proposal No. 67 is indicating that the number should move to 45. So there is some opposition to this. I would urge that you give your most earnest consideration to passage of Proposal No. 66.

John J. Hinga (Heartland Collegiate Conference): Being a private-school conference, we made a survey of the cost of school versus many of the schools that we play. We find the average cost of our five private schools is approximately \$11,000 a year. We are competing against state schools in the Division II level in the Midwest, where their average cost of schooling is around \$4,500 to \$4,700 a year. We feel that if we could lower the limit from 40 to 35, it will give us a chance to compete more fairly. We feel that if we are all reading from the same page or coming out of the same checkbook, we can compete nationally. We have no visions of moving into Division I-AA or I-A. And, we feel that if we stay in Division II football, it will be to the best advantage to ourselves, particularly in private schools, and everyone if we all can cost contain the cost of football.

Noel W. Olsen (North Central International Athletic Conference): It's kind of interesting to hear that comment; because in our conference, we have two private schools and they are probably the schools that are strongest for defeating this particular legislation. We believe that there is a tremendous conflict between O.I. 600 aid and exempted aid that is affected by this proposal. If you are familiar with O.I. 600 aid and its accountability, you know that if we were to bring our football scholarship level to 35, we would have to include

O.I. 600 aid in there if any dollars of athletics aid are involved. You cannot exempt any O.I. 600 aid, unless there are no dollars of athletics aid involved. This simply means that if you give a small partial scholarship to a football player, all O.I. 600 aid then must be counted. And that can be a sizable amount depending upon the need factor of the individual.

Another factor that we think will be affected in this area is the multiple-sport aid. For example, if a track athlete or a wrestling athlete is receiving a scholarship and he is also playing football, that individual will be counted in football and so will all of his O.I. 600 aid. We mostly give partial scholarships in football in Division II; because, obviously, football requires, on most campuses, no less than 80 players and many have above 100. If we would only have 35 scholarships with that many athletes, it would be a very unusual comparison with the sport of basketball, which has 12 scholarships. And, that's the average size of a squad. Certainly, I am not saying that we should reduce basketball. But it's certainly a very, very difficult comparison for a football coach to see. Let's not move any closer to Division III and forget that we are Division II. Let's keep our Division II cleanly separated from Division III. We urge the defeat of Proposal No. 66.

Harold J. McGee (Jacksonville State University): We speak in opposition to the proposal. We know a lot more about cost containment as proposed by No. 39 coming forward. I believe we have gone far enough in reduction based on scholarships to the student. Cost containment in football is much more expensive than the student needs on an individual basis. I think we need not to reduce that further. There are practical implications as addressed about size of the squads and number of athletes required. Our speaker yesterday afternoon talked about our need to cease bringing proposals that really are single-conference in nature, really institutional in nature and try to resolve those at that level and not try each year to make nationally applicable standards that relate only to our conference.

Edward S. Steitz (Springfield College): Being a private institution and a great believer of broad-based programs, 27 varsity sports, and being on a financial-need basis, we are concerned, most concerned, about cost containment. We urge the adoption of this particular amendment.

Bob Moorman (Central Intercollegiate Athletic Association): We have, I think, seven private schools in our conference and we are poor beyond comparison. We still are able to compete nationally, so we urge the defeat of this.

[Proposal No. 66 (Page A-66) was defeated by Division II, 39-67.]

Maximum Awards—Division II Football

Noel W. Olsen (North Central Intercollegiate Athletic Conference): I would like to move adoption of Proposal No. 67.

[The motion was seconded.]

As I indicated before, and I won't go over all the reasons

because they are very much the same as I gave you in opposition to No. 66, we feel that we have to look more carefully at countable aid. Probably, it's a little more difficult to understand our proposal, because it's written in a little different language than most of our financial aid amendments. Please understand that contrary to what was stated by one of the speakers earlier, this is not an amendment to increase athletics scholarships for football to 45. This is an amendment to allow countable aid to go up to 45, and football scholarships would remain at 40.

Again, the reason for that is that we do spread out so much of our aid in partial-packaging deals with a lot of the government O.I. 600 aid. This allows us to do this, and it will not hurt an athlete. It is not a factor in increasing costs in any manner, because all of the additional aid would have to be O.I. 600 aid, but it has nothing to do with athletics scholarships. So it wouldn't cost one dime to any institution more than what is currently on the records. Because of this, we would ask your support for Proposal No. 67.

Mr. Elwell: Noel, the steering committee had a couple of questions on this proposal. Specifically, right now, you could have as many exempted players as could meet the criteria, you know, as certified by your faculty rep and the financial aid director. So, would this limit you to only five of those kinds of people, or you could still have as many as meet the criteria?

Mr. Olsen: The intent of it would not limit it. Of course, it would only help you when you are giving athletics aid. If you give \$1 of athletics aid, you cannot exempt it, Bud. And that's where our problem is. As soon as you give \$1 in the equivalency type financial aid program that we have in Division II, \$1 of athletics aid eliminates you from an exception of that aid. And so, it allows us to give aid to an athlete that is deserving and has a need factor. I also am concerned about the multiple-sport athlete, because we do double up a lot in Division II and have wrestling and football combinations. We have track and football combinations very often. And remember that the aid is countable for football if they double up in two sports.

All this is doing is protecting us from not being able to give a reasonable amount of financial aid to a needy student-athlete. It doesn't allow us to be abusive in any way financially, because it doesn't cost one dime more for athletics aid.

Christopher T. Fisher (North Carolina Central University): When you say "to five," are you talking about the equivalent of five or just five people?

Mr. Olsen: It's an equivalency situation, as all of our aid is in Division II.

Mr. Fisher: So, in essence, you could have 50 people, basically, that would come out to the five.

Fred M. Martinelli (Ashland College): I speak in opposition to this proposition. Aid is aid is aid. This, in essence, would be an

increase of five institutional (scholarships) in the sport of football.

Mark Kosciuszko (Ferris State University): I speak in opposition to this. If they want to do a financial aid package, I recommend that they repropose or have some proposals in that area. This does increase the football scholarships by five. If they have some problems with financial aid, they should approach it from a financial aid standpoint instead of changing the number of grant aids.

Mr. Olsen: I wish somebody would tell us how to deal with that financial aid in another way. If we could, we would. We had a hard time separating it out, too. We don't have an answer. Would somebody explain to me how you can separate it out. It is not an increase in football scholarships. It is simply an increase in financial aid, which is an entitlement of any student. And it's spreading the aid out over many, many athletes. We are not in a body-count situation in Division II; we have an entirely different financial aid situation. Let me give you one classic example. You are giving \$1 of athletics aid to a football player. That immediately eliminates that football player from exemption in terms of the 40 football scholarships that we now allow. Now he receives a job at a local gas station during the school year. It doesn't make any difference how he got the job, that's countable aid. That is a classic example, and I have a feeling that throughout the country we are not in tune on what O.I. 600 aid does. No. 2 is how it fits into the athletics-scholarship program in the equivalency system of Division II. If anybody can dispute any of those things, I'd sure like to hear them; because we will use that system, too. That is where we have our problem is that we are counting everything in our conference.

Mr. Elwell: If you don't give the \$1 of aid, though, all the aid that the youngster has is not accountable.

Mr. Olsen: That's correct. That is correct. If you don't give any aid, but we try to spread out the aid as far as we can. In a sport like football where you have 80 athletes, that is how you get yourself in trouble in terms of accountability.

[Proposal No. 67 (Page A-66) was defeated by Division II.]

REVIEW OF PROPOSED AMENDMENTS

General

Raymond M. Burse (Kentucky State University): Before I begin discussing Nos. 69 through 81, can we go back to Proposal No. 50? That's the proposal being put forth by several schools relating to the obvious qualifier. One of the things that you should know is that the Council is opposed to Proposal No. 50. If you look at the interpretation on the blue sheet, you would notice that the interpretation said that if you have one of those individuals, that student does not have to satisfy the core-curriculum requirements, which the Council thinks is very important and was a very key

ingredient as a part of Bylaw 5-1-(j). The Council has revised Forms 48-H and 48-C for this coming year, which will allow for a checkoff on the form for an obvious qualifier. But, in checking off for the obvious qualifier, the individual must still meet the minimum threshold of a 700 SAT or the 15 ACT. That individual also must not have any grade in the core courses lower than a "C." Proposal No. 50 would eliminate the core-curriculum requirement.

Now, back to No. 69. Proposal No. 69 is the resolution adopting the new Manual. Proposal No. 70, is a resolution giving the Council the power over the next year, if there have been any errors in going from the old Manual to the new Manual in terms of the language, to correct that and publish it in The NCAA News. But, it must come back to next year's Convention with legislation to correct that. That is what Proposal No. 70 does. It gives the Council that power for that one year.

The next one, Proposal 71, which is a faculty athletics representative proposal, has an amendment that would eliminate requiring the faculty athletics representative to certify student-athlete eligibility. The Council has taken no position on Proposal No. 71. Proposal No. 71 would establish that an institution shall designate a faculty athletics representative and that individual cannot be an administrator or an individual holding a position on the athletics department staff.

Proposal 72 is to be withdrawn. If it's not withdrawn, it would allow the Council to waive your bylaws in any specific instance; and therefore, the Council is opposed to this. The Council has taken the position that there should be selective waivers in certain areas. And if you remember at last year's Convention, there was a proposal passed that allows the Council to change legislation in accordance with the interpretation of that legislation; but it must come back to you one year later with legislation to support that change. Proposal 72 would be a case-by-case instance in which it would open the door for one institution, and then slam the door in the face of the next one.

Proposal No. 73 is out of the Metro Conference and would require that institutions notify the NCAA in written form regarding all violations of NCAA rules. The Council is opposed to this for the simple reason that in the new Manual, this already is required. So it is redundant to add this to the legislation that already is in place. There is an amendment that has been submitted extracting the word "written report" and now requiring an oral report. But the Council's position is basically the same. It already is required in the Manual; so, therefore, there is no need to add this particular piece of legislation.

Proposal No. 74 is on off-season drug testing. One year ago, off-season drug testing for steroids in football was approved so that institutions could, on a voluntary basis, have some of their football players tested. This proposal would extend it to other

sports as determined by the institution, but the total number of athletes that would be tested would remain the same. So, therefore, there basically is no change.

Proposal No. 75 would be moot if Proposal No. 48 passes. And what this would require is an increase the number of individuals who must sponsor amendments to amendments to five. This piece of legislation was developed prior to the Council developing the legislative calendar, which is Proposal No. 48. Proposal No. 76 would develop what is called the Manual Maintenance Committee, which would basically take up where Wil Bailey's committee left off. This committee would be in charge of reviewing interpretations, incorporating new legislation into the form and the language of the new Manual, and looking at other similar issues.

Proposal No. 77 establishes a Student-Athlete Advisory Committee and as was reported on Sunday would give to student-athletes an opportunity to react and provide input directly into the Association. That committee will be composed of 16 individuals, eight from Division I, four from Division II, four from Division III. And then that representation will be drawn on a regional basis. Proposal No. 78 would establish a Baseball Rules Committee and would establish division committees to run the championships. Proposal No. 79 would establish an Ice Hockey Rules Committee, and would establish Division I and Division III championships committees to take care of the championships. Proposal No. 80 would create a combined Men's and Women's Soccer Rules Committee and then give to the men's committee and the women's committee the responsibility for the championships. And Proposal No. 81 is to be withdrawn.

[Note: The Division II business session was recessed at 10:15 a.m. and reconvened at 10:30 a.m.]

Recruiting

Jerry M. Hughes (Central Missouri State University): Proposal No. 82, Prospective Student-Athlete, proposed by the NCAA Council and referred to Council from the Recruiting Committee, would define the perspective student-athletes for Bylaw 1 purposes as any individuals who have started classes for the ninth grade. The proposal also specifies that the recruitment of a person who has not started classes for the ninth grade shall be governed by the principle that the institution may not provide such an individual financial aid or other benefits that the institution cannot normally do.

No. 83, Contact Restrictions, also is proposed by the Council as referred from the Recruiting Committee to apply the contact restrictions outlined in Bylaw 1-2-(g) to any athletics competition in which a prospective student-athlete is a participant, regardless of the size of competition. No. 84 is Division I only. No. 85, Summer Sports Camps and Summer Clinics, has an amendment to the amendment and an interpretation. The amendment to the original proposal has removed

the word "summer" from in front of all sports camps and clinics. Proposal 85 would revise and simplify the Association's sports camp and clinic legislation by defining a member institution's sports camp or clinic as one owned and operated by the member institution or an employee of the member institution's athletics department.

Proposal 86, Tryouts for Developmental Clinics, once again is proposed by the NCAA Council and referred from the Recruiting Committee to specify that developmental-clinic participants shall not receive recruiting presentations and must reside in the state in which the host institution is located or within 100 miles of the host institution. Proposal Nos. 87, 88 and 89 are Division I only.

PROPOSED AMENDMENTS

Contact Period—Division II Football

Ralph Barkey (Sonoma State University): On behalf of the six football-playing institutions in the Northern California Athletic Conference, I move the adoption of Proposal No. 90.

[The motion was seconded.]

Charles A. Eberle (Pennsylvania State Athletic Conference): I'd like to move the adoption of Proposal No. 90—1.

[The motion was seconded.]

We feel that in the proposed amendment, 30 days is an excessive period. We would like to reduce that to approximately 17 days. As a compromise, we feel that would give our coaches time to contact young men for Division II after the Division I coaches have finished their particular contact period. We feel that this is something that is good legislation that will allow us to make the contacts that we need after Division I, after players have signed with Division I. So we would hope you will support this amendment.

[Proposal No. 90—1 (Page A-89) was approved by Division II. See Page A-90 for subsequent voting action.]

Mr. Barkey: The sponsors of Proposal No. 90 met and certainly were not opposed to No. 90—1. We do feel, however, that 30 days is a touch more necessary than 15 to 17 days depending on when that Saturday falls in February. We find in our area and particularly in the state of California that 30 days is necessary. There is an identification process that has to take place.

Jerry M. Hughes (Central Missouri State University): As a member of the Division II Steering Committee and the Council, I would like to speak in opposition to Proposal No. 90 as amended. Proposal No. 90 as amended would expand the recruiting period beyond the basic four-month approach that has been approved by the membership and utilized by the Council in developing recruiting calendars in those sports where restrictions are in place. Proposal No. 91, which we will talk about later, treats the concerns of the Division II members without expanding that amount of time. It's believed that limiting the contact periods reduces the interference with the prospective student-athletes' high school education and athletics participation and helps control our institution's recruiting

costs. The Division II Steering Committee supports the modification that has been set forth in No. 91, and we urge your defeat of Proposal 90.

[Proposal No. 90 (Page A-89) was approved as amended by No. 90—1. See Page A-90 for subsequent voting action.]

[Proposal No. 91 (Page A-90) was moot due to the approval of No. 90.]

Contact Period—Division II Basketball

Alfred R. Mathews Jr. (California State University, Hayward): I move the adoption of Proposal No. 92.

[The motion was seconded.]

I don't think it's necessary to give you the same argument that you just heard for Division II football. We don't think that 30 days is too much. We need 30 days. I think the coaches need 30 days. Quite a few of the coaches have teaching responsibilities; and so what looks like 30 days actually ends up, perhaps, at six or eight days. So, we urge your support of this proposal for Division II basketball.

Jerry M. Hughes (Central Missouri State University): Once again, as Al said, the Division II Steering Committee and the Council is opposed to this proposal and likes the provision set forward as our steering committee has in No. 93, which would give our coaches one additional week. We feel that with one additional week, if things are done properly up to that point and the student-athlete does not sign a letter of intent with a Division I school, one additional week would allow us to contact those student-athletes and keep consistent the four-month calendar as was passed previously by the Convention.

Richard H. Perry (University of California, Riverside): I understand the thinking of the Council and the steering committee that this extended period might impact negatively on the student-athletes' activities. Yesterday we just heard about a \$1.7 million study that told us that the students felt the recruiting process did indeed assist them in better decision making. It seems to me that for those marginal Division I and Division II athletes, this proposal gives an opportunity to respond to that data and help them make a permanent and a quality decision. I would move the support of this proposal.

Bob Moorman (Central Intercollegiate Athletic Association): One of the problems you have with 30 days, as Al mentioned, is that when you are teaching and you are driving, you really cut into the time. We don't hop on a plane and go someplace. Plus the fact, you have a bunch of kids who have thought Division I; and all of a sudden, they didn't make it. So you need the time, I think, to convince them. And, it's not going to cost you that much money. So we are in favor of it.

[Proposal No. 92 (Page A-90) was approved by Division II.]

[Proposal No. 93 (Page A-91) was moot due to the approval of No. 92.]

Reconsideration of Contact Period—Division II Football

Edward H. Hammond (Fort Hays State University): I would like

to move for reconsideration of Proposal No. 90, as amended by No. 90-1.

[The motion was seconded.]

What we are trying to do is to develop some symmetry between basketball and football in terms of the number of days that we are providing in this proposal. The motion to reconsider would permit this group as a body to vote on that issue again for football. The action we have taken limits it to the February date or between 14 and 17 days. The action we just took regarding basketball gives us 30 days. I am hoping that the group will see the wisdom in treating both the same, especially when football recruits so many more individuals than basketball.

[Proposal No. 90 (Page A-89), as amended by No. 90-1, was reconsidered and defeated by Division II.]

Edward H. Hammond (Fort Hays State University): I'd like to move the adoption of Proposal No. 90, as submitted.

[The motion was seconded.]

[Proposal No. 90 (Page A-89) was approved by Division II.]

Evaluation Periods—Division II Football

Noel W. Olsen (North Central Intercollegiate Athletic Conference): I move the adoption of Proposal No. 95.

[The motion was seconded.]

As everyone can tell by looking at the program, there are several attempts to increase the evaluation period in football and bring it in line with basketball. I believe ours is the one to vote for, although I would support all of them. The reason I feel that way about No. 95 is because it does include the all-star game in the state in which the member institution is located. It really is foolish not to be able to attend an all-star game in your state as a public relations gesture, which we can't do right now. And, of course, it is even more foolish not to be able to attend a high school football game in your own hometown, as we can't do now during the months of September and October. Most of us play the majority of our schedule during those two months. I think this brings football in line with basketball. I think it's very logical. It is not a major cost factor in Division II, because the travel factor for recruiting during the early part of the season is very, very limited to the local area in most cases.

[Proposal No. 95 (Page A-92) was approved by Division II.]

[Proposal Nos. 96, 97 and 98 (Pages A-92-93) were moot due to the approval of No. 95.]

Printed Recruiting Aids—Division II

Joan Boand (Grand Valley State University): On behalf of the NCAA Council and the Division II Steering Committee, I move the adoption of Proposal No. 100.

[The motion was seconded.]

This proposal would add to the list of materials that are permissible for a Division II member institution to send to a prospective student-athlete, a student-athlete handbook. Division II members are not

required to have such handbooks and are not required to send them to prospects if they do not have them. This proposal merely permits the institution to send one to a prospect if it believes that the handbook would be helpful to the prospect in understanding the specific policies of the institution in reference to its handling of student-athletes and the expectations of them. I urge your support of this legislation.

[Proposal No. 100 (Page A-94) was approved by Division II.]

REVIEW OF PROPOSED AMENDMENTS

Recruiting

Jerry M. Hughes (Central Missouri State University): Proposal No. 101 is for Division I only. Proposal No. 102 is from the Council and the Recruiting Committee. It concerns self-financed trips and confirms that a member institution is permitted to transport a prospective student-athlete during a self-financed trip to view off-campus practice and competition sites within a 30-mile radius of the institution's campus. We might note that the Council opposes Proposal No. 103. It's mainly for Division I member institutions. This would allow Division I graduate-assistant coaches to get back into the transportation business. That was done away with a few years ago, and that's where a number of the violations occurred in Division I institutions—when those graduate assistants or part-time assistants got the prospective student-athletes in the car with them one-on-one.

Championships and Extra Events

Elwood N. Shields (Bentley College): Proposal No. 104, I understand, has been withdrawn. Proposal No. 105 would reinstate the executive regulation as it applied prior to August 1, 1987, permitting advancement by Divisions II and III student-athletes into Division I championships.

Noel W. Olsen (North Central Intercollegiate Athletic Conference): I will just give a quick explanation. I think everybody understands that it's the attempt for individual sports to be able to advance to Division I championships. As long as I have been an athletics administrator, I have heard from sports such as wrestling and track and swimming that they need this chance to advance, because it enhances their recruiting. They often are going to have an athlete that becomes national and international caliber and develops in the Division II program. They believe that they should have a chance to move on to the Division I championships. Personally, I think Division I should accept this; because I believe that if they did, they would keep some of us from trying to move up into Division I. We probably should keep our programs in Division II. I think everybody knows that this is primarily legislation that is being put forth by the wrestling people. They feel most strongly about it.

Mr. Shields: I would mention to you that the Division II Steering Committee is in favor of this. The Division I and Division III committees are not. And, in fact, I am led to believe that the Executive Committee will speak against it.

Proposal No. 106 would specify that a Division II member institution that is classified in Division III in football would not be eligible for the Division III Football Championship unless its football program was classified in Division III prior to September 1, 1988.

Jerry M. Hughes (Central Missouri State University): I'd like to speak to No. 106 just briefly to help the membership of Division II understand it a little bit. We currently have four Division II programs that have their football programs placed in Division III. Last year as the Council was going through several multidivision classification issues, every one that came before Council, whether it be I, II, or III, was referred to the membership's restructuring committee. As you know, the charge of that committee is to review the membership structure. And one of those charges is to look at multidivision classification. The institutions that last year placed their football programs in Division III thought that they would be eligible for a championship in Division III. However the interpretation said their program had to be in prior to last year. So they are caught in a box. They can play Division III football, but they cannot compete for the championship.

It really has become a matter of policy between the Division II Steering Committee and Divisions I and III, who could outvote us. The Division II Steering Committee thinks that all these issues should be considered by the membership restructuring committee and would urge your defeat of this proposal.

Mr. Shields: As one of the institutions involved, I'd just like to add to what Jerry said. With the assumption that because competition was approved in August and with the assumption that it would be grandfathered, a football conference was formed consisting of both Division II institutions and Division III institutions. If this were to pass, not only would we always be ineligible for a championship—the only sport, by the way, with multiclassifications would be ineligible—but we would have schools playing by different rules within the same conference. We urge the defeat of this proposal.

[Note: A straw vote indicated that the Division II delegates would not approve No. 106.]

Mr. Shields: Proposal No. 107 seems to be really a Division III issue, in that it would pull Division III out of Executive Regulation 1-3-(i) regarding the selection of conference champions. No. 108 is Division III football only.

Eligibility

Joan Boand (Grand Valley State University): Proposal No. 109 is a Southwest Conference proposal to require automobile and loan information on the student-athletes statement. Proposal No. 110, is a Council-sponsored proposal to eliminate all the restrictions of prospective student-athletes participation in high school all-star games. Proposal No. 111 is a proposal sponsored by ice hockey-playing institutions that would deny the loss of at least one season of eligibility to student-athletes and prohibit them from participating

in their first season of intercollegiate play because of playing on teams that are classified as major junior A hockey in this country and in Canada.

Proposal No. 112 would allow member institutions to pay expenses for their student-athletes to go to tryouts for the Olympic volleyball teams. The Council would recommend that this proposal be referred to the committee on amateurism for further study. Proposal No. 113 would move the summer basketball legislation from the constitution to the bylaws, thus allowing each division to apply its own legislation. This is sponsored by a group of New York institutions; and if A fails, B would be moot. Proposal No. 114, I understand, has been withdrawn. Proposal No. 115 is a Division III-only proposal. Proposal No. 116 would remove the consideration of a student-athletes' financial aid status at the original institution from the one-time exemption to the transfer-residence requirement. This proposal is opposed by the Council. It also would be moot if Proposal No. 115 passes. Proposal No. 117 would be moot if either 115 or 116 passes. This would allow the student-athlete to receive the one-time exemption to the transfer-residence requirement when the institution dropped the student from the team. Proposal No. 118 would permit a four-to-four transfer student to be eligible if the first four-year institution did not sponsor the student-athlete's sport. Proposal No. 119 would permit a nonrecruited junior college transfer to qualify for a Bylaw 5-1-(n)-(3) waiver, if the transfer was not recruited and did not participate in practice, other than limited preseason tryouts. Proposal Nos. 120 and 121 are Division I-only proposals.

Membership and Classification

R. Bruce Allison (Colorado School of Mines): We have four amendments before us in the membership and classification division. The first, No. 122, would permit a one-year probationary period for institutions failing to meet minimum sports sponsorship criteria for their respective divisions once in every 10 years. In reference to the amendment, there is an interpretation that merely would clarify when that 10-year period commences after the restriction was placed. The Council has sponsored an amendment to No. 122, and the Council has offered a number of alternative subparagraphs. And as I understand it, basically, these would permit the Council to authorize exceptions to the mandatory restricted membership, given certain sets of circumstances.

Proposal No. 123, Restricted Membership Waiver, is sponsored by the Council and would confirm that a member institution that receives a waiver of the restricted-membership classification may receive an immediate change in membership status. Proposal No. 124, Sports Sponsorship Criteria, would specify that for meeting the sports sponsorship criteria in individual sports, not more than two institution-versus-institution meetings in a multiteam competition shall be counted as contests.

And finally, in this category, No. 125 is a Division III-only matter.

Joseph A. Gore (Valdosta State College): If I may, I'd like to go back to No. 122 and ask if that, in fact, means that in order to be classified in the probationary period, the request must be approved by Council.

Mr. Allison: That is correct.

Mr. Gore: Is that automatic?

Mr. Allison: That is correct.

Mr. Gore: I would hope, then, that this amendment would be defeated for the following reason: Many times, an institution is not aware that it is going to have difficulty sponsoring a sport in a light spring. Many times, we have difficulty sponsoring a team in a women's sport for a variety of reasons. Therefore, if we were not able to sponsor a sport, and Council did not approve our request, then we automatically would go on the restrictive membership list. We would not have an opportunity to save ourselves, so to speak, try to get some other sport sponsored at that time.

Rudy Carvajal (California State University, Bakersfield): I just wanted a clarification on Proposal No. 124. If you have three quadrangulans in track and field are you not going to be able to count more than two? Is the third quadrangular then eliminated as a contest?

Steve Morgan (NCAA): You can have as many quadrangulans as you want, but none of them counts more than two events. But you could have four quadrangulans, all of which count as two events, if that's what you choose to do. It doesn't place a limit on the number of quadrangulans that you can have. It's just trying to keep you from meeting the criteria through a very small number of meets that have a lot of institutions in it.

Christopher T. Fisher (North Carolina Central University): If you have a women's softball team, are you saying that it can't play a particular school more than twice a year?

Mr. Allison: No, we are not saying that at all, sir. What we are saying is that if you have a gathering of institutions on a particular day or days for multiple meets, that you may count only two with individual scores. You may count only two of those toward the criteria for minimum numbers of contests in that particular sport, for meeting sponsorship criteria.

Raymond M. Burse (Kentucky State University): Let me give you the rationale behind the Council-proposed amendment to Proposal No. 122. The original amendment, if passed, would mean that those who were violating the rule intentionally, intentionally violated in terms of not having sufficient sport sponsorship, those institutions immediately would get a probationary year. It would be in the same category as an institution that ended up in track needing 14 participants, one participant gets sick at a particular meet and a waiver is needed.

That school would have an unintentional violation, it would be a sort of a minimum violation, as opposed to those who intentionally violated the rule.

The thinking also is, that there should be some responsibility placed on the institution. It shouldn't be automatic. The institution ought to come forward and justify why it did not sponsor a sufficient number of sports to meet our membership criteria. So, that is the reason the Council has proposed that it set up an appeal process, if the amendment to the amendment is passed, to clear up this entire matter. The Council wants to be certain that there is justifiable reason for institutions having not sponsored a sufficient number of sports to meet the membership criteria.

Playing Seasons

Karen L. Miller (California State Polytechnic University, Pomona): The first proposal, No. 126, is a Division I concern and it will be withdrawn. The next proposal, No. 127, Playing Seasons—Segment Break, is sponsored by members of the New Jersey Athletic Conference. The purpose is to eliminate the requirement that playing-season segments consist of consecutive weeks. In other words, they would be able to break them into various portions. But this still would be contained within the traditional and nontraditional seasons. The steering committee and Council is opposed to this motion.

The Council also is in opposition to No. 128, Practice Activities—Captain's Practices. It is sponsored by the Southwest Athletic Conference, and it refers to the inclusion of captain's practices, your captain organizing practices and bringing your student-athletes together. The purpose is to include captain's practices within the definition of practice activities outside the permissible playing and practice season and to try to avoid additional assembling of your student-athletes. No. 129, Football Coaches Retirement Trust Benefit Game, is for football only. The source is the members of Division I, but the purpose of this is to exclude the participation of Divisions I-A, I-AA, II or III member institutions in the American Football Coaches Association Retirement Trust benefit game from preseason and numerical contest limitations, allowing our student-athletes to participate in this game above the contest limitations.

No. 130, Preseason Practice—Women's Volleyball, is proposed by a number of Division I and Division II institutions, and the intent is to permit a member institution's women's volleyball program to commence preseason practice activities on the day that will permit a maximum of 29 practice opportunities prior to the first scheduled intercollegiate match. The Council is in opposition to this.

Jerry M. Hughes (Central Missouri State University): The Council has opposed Proposal No. 130. On the face of it, it might look a little innocuous; it might look like the same proposal that we are dealing with in football. But you have to understand that there is a difference. Volleyball can start its first contest on August 15. Football is September 1. So, if you back up 29 days from August 15, I think you can all figure when volleyball might be able to start practice as this is written.

Ms. Miller: No. 131, Playing Season, is for Division I baseball; and the Council is in opposition to that. No. 132 is withdrawn. No. 133

is also a Division I matter.

PROPOSED AMENDMENTS

Playing Season—Division II Baseball

Tom D. Morgan (California Collegiate Athletic Association): I'd like to move the adoption of Proposal No. 134.

[The motion was seconded.]

If you have any questions, I have a member of the committee from baseball here, so he can answer, I believe, anything on the criteria and so forth. What we simply are trying to do is move it back in the academic year.

Jerry M. Hughes (Central Missouri State University): On behalf of Council and Division II Steering Committee, I would like to oppose Proposal No. 134. It's Council's understanding that this proposal will allow practice and competition for the sport of baseball during the summer. This is in total opposition to what we passed when we approved the 26-week playing-practice-season legislation. If we are going to allow such exceptions for the sport of baseball, perhaps we should look at this issue for several other sports in the summer. We would urge your opposition to this proposal.

Robert J. Hiegert (California State University, Northridge): I am a member of the NCAA Baseball Committee and chair of Division II baseball subcommittee. We are not trying to allow baseball practice to continue beyond the 26-week period; it is doing that now. There has been summer baseball programs in your cities and your townships across this country since 1900. They are municipal programs. They are legion programs. They are well-organized programs going on without our control. I just returned from Nashville, where 80 Division II baseball coaches were meeting along with David Knopp from legislative services. In discussing the rule as it currently affects Division II baseball programs in the summer, we were told that you can have a limited number of players on any of these municipal teams from the same institutional team; but if any of your coaches offer any kind of coaching to any of those players, or is coaching, that is a violation. That is going on now all across the country. None of us, or at least few of us in the California Collegiate Athletic Association, have full-time paid assistants in baseball. We have graduate assistants, we have part-time coaches, we have volunteer coaches. Many of these kids also are still playing actively. If they are playing and one of your recruited players is on that same team, that is a violation.

Many of the summer-baseball programs continue through the whole summer. At the conclusion of the summer programs, which is around August first, there are invitations sent out for the National Baseball Congress amateur play-offs. If you are a coach who has been operating in accordance with the rules, has worked with someone else's student-athletes, and one of your student-athletes is invited to an all-star team that you are coaching, he has to make a decision whether to get off your team or play on that all-star team.

As the chair of the Division II baseball subcommittee, I have received a lot of phone calls this last year trying to get clarification on this. As Karen just indicated, one of the original arguments for moving to the academic year from the calendar year base was that we wanted to control the programs that are going year-round in many sports, baseball being one of them.

However, your student-athletes still are going to be playing baseball, although they are not being coached by your people, probably. I think if you want to prevent them from playing in a municipal program that runs right up through October first, then getting into your 26-week academic-year calendar and stopping around May first so that the athlete is playing year round, you can look at an amendment that would allow an interruption of that academic year. We would start baseball at our institution September 1 for a week; we will take a 10-week break and start our academic-year calendar later on. Then you will stop the year-round program, if that is your intent. But I think this is a little bit different consideration for baseball—this academic year and calendar year—than any other sport because the athletes still are playing baseball.

[Proposal No. 134 (Page A-117) was defeated by Division II, 53-75. See Page A-117 for subsequent voting action.]

REVIEW OF PROPOSED AMENDMENTS

Deregulation/Simplification

Elwood N. Shields (Bentley College): These proposals are sponsored by the Deregulation and Rules Simplification Committee.

There are now six different rules relative to contacts. This proposal, No. 143, if passed, would set a common number of contacts at the high school and at other sites for all involved for Divisions I and II. No. 144 is permissible legislation sponsored by the dereg committee. It broadens, under specific conditions, the regulations regarding the promotional and charitable use of a student's name and pictures. No. 145 would permit a Division I or II basketball or football coach to speak at a meeting or banquet outside the recruiting contact period even though the meeting or banquet is not open to the public. I imagine that would allow a meeting of all 6-3, 280 pounders. The Division II Steering Committee is opposed.

Edward B. Harris (Missouri Western State College): I would like to speak in support of this resolution. I come from the school in Northwest Missouri. We have an awful lot of very small schools in that area, some of which have eight-man football, some of which may have, you know, just very few athletes. There is a very small pool of banquet speakers for those people, and they call me on a daily basis and want to get a coach to come out. I have to tell them that the banquet has to be open to the general public or they can't have one of my coaches. It's not appropriate. I think we should have a situation where the coaches can go in if they are not recruiting.

Mr. Elwell: Well, this, obviously, would eliminate that restriction. As I say, you can attend any meeting or banquet attended by one

prospect, if that is what you want to call a meeting or banquet; and your coach, if this is eliminated, would be free to speak as long as he didn't make a recruiting presentation.

Mr. Shields: No. 146, Travel to NCAA Championships and Special Events During Vacation Period, also is sponsored by the deregulation committee. It would eliminate the current restrictions and would simplify the rules relative to travel to NCAA events during the vacation period. No. 147 is for Divisions I-A, I-AA, II and III football only. It would eliminate the three options that are listed now and instead would substitute 29 practice opportunities.

WAIVERS

[Note: The Division II business session heard petitions for waivers of Division II membership criteria from Northeastern Illinois University, Paine College and the University of South Carolina at Spartanburg. Although a petition also was heard from Lenoir-Rhyne College later in the business session, it is included here for convenience of reference. The petitions were approved.]

[The Division II business session was recessed at 12 p.m.]

Tuesday Afternoon, January 10, 1989

The Division II business session was called to order at 1:30 p.m., with Mr. Elwell presiding.

Mr. Elwell: If you can come to order, please. We skipped over this morning, Proposal Nos. 69 and 70, which have to do with the adoption of the new Manual. We are very pleased to have with us to start our session this afternoon, the president of the NCAA, who also chaired the committee on the new Manual, Mr. Wilford Bailey.

REVIEW OF PROPOSED AMENDMENTS

Wilford S. Bailey (Auburn University): Some months ago, when we were making plans for the Convention and for addressing legislation, we asked that the division business sessions be arranged so that we as a committee might have an opportunity to make an appearance. At that time, we thought it might be desirable to go into a more detailed explanation about some things regarding the revised Manual than we think today is necessary, given the verifying series of articles that the staff of The NCAA News has prepared and published. I am sure most of you have seen and read these. There are two or three points that we would like to comment about just briefly and then all the members of the committee are here to respond to any questions that you may have.

First of all, we recognized from the beginning that given our assignment we could not expect a perfect revised Manual. Therefore, it was necessary to have some kind of a safety valve, which is the purpose of Proposal No. 70; so that if it is found with "field use" of the Manual that we inadvertently, in revising the wording in an effort to make it easier to read and to understand, have changed the intent of the legislation, in spite of our best efforts and with all the review that the drafts received, that there was an opportunity for the membership to bring that to the attention of the Council. The Council could correct any wording that was found in error so that we had not changed the meaning or intent, publish that in The NCAA News and then bring corrective amendments back to the Convention next year. We could not have been comfortable as a committee without that kind of protection, and I think you would not have been as comfortable as we hope you will be in voting for No. 69 without that kind of protection.

We have had brought to our attention already a couple of places where we have been asked to review the wording that we inadvertently may have changed slightly. In one of these, it appears that the wording we have used is consistent with the wording in the case that is now incorporated into legislation for a greater logic in the flow of the regulations. We will review those and report to Council. Also, in the final preparation of the "Where Did It Go List," which I hope all of you will get if you have not picked up one at the display of the revised Manual, we found that we had not included a citation for Constitution 3-9-(c)-(1); the correct place for that, as is indicated here, is 17.1.1. It is a definition of the playing season. There is nothing in error in the proposed Manual, other than the fact we did not include

the citation of that one section of the constitution. It will be in the printed Manual when you get it in late March or early April that incorporates the changes adopted at this Convention.

Finally, we recommended last October to the Council and Executive Committee that consideration be given to making available to the member institutions, or conferences, the new Manual on computer disk. We were able to announce to the Council on Friday that that will be possible. The computer disks will be available as soon as we can make them available after the publication of the new Manual in late March or early April. They will be IBM compatible disks, will require six or seven disks, and the price will be approximately \$4 each.

All of us appreciate very much the help and encouragement that you have given. Many of you have assisted in revising drafts, reading them, making suggestions. You have helped in other ways, and we are here to try to respond to any questions you may have, so that we can resolve those, hopefully, before we address Nos. 69 and 70 tomorrow. I think I might make the observation, which you probably already have identified in reviewing the packet distributed this morning of the amendments to amendments and the resolutions, that there was opportunity for the membership to change a relatively large number of items and four different elements, as was announced Sunday, and that description was on one of the handouts we asked you to review. There was not a single request for review on the proposed changes, the voting requirement, or the interpretations that were incorporated, changes in enforcement policies, procedures or any of the new wording. We do that with a great deal of satisfaction. In large part, it is due to the help we got from the membership and from the staff over the past three and a half years. It's been a long difficult job, but we appreciate the help and cooperation and assistance you have given.

Mr. Elwell: Well, I know you and your committee will be duly recognized tomorrow for the incredible amount of work you have put into this project. We thank you and congratulate you, and rest assured that we are going to do all we can to pass those two proposals.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

Division II Championships Committee

Mr. Elwell: As you know, the duties of this committee are to make recommendations to the full Executive Committee regarding allocation of the Executive Committee-approved subsidy, which are the block grants, for the conduct of the Division II championships. We also are responsible for the supervision, qualification and selection procedures for all these events; maintain oversight responsibility for applicable playing regulations in the area of player safety, financial impact and image of the sport; review recommendations from sports committees regarding the conduct and administration of those championships, and process all other issues related to the administration of these events.

Now, all of our actions are subject, obviously, to the approval of the complete Executive Committee. In the next couple of minutes, I will attempt to summarize some of the more pertinent actions taken by the championships committee; and I will try to concentrate on those policy decisions that affected the membership in the increase in bracket size in various championships and the administration of the Division II block grant. First of all, regarding championship site-selection criteria, the committee reviewed the criteria used to determine sites for NCAA championships competition and agreed that all governing sports committees within Division II should use the same criteria when selecting sites. In addition, the committee determined that the pertinent regulations should be clarified to indicate that financial guidelines designed to insure fiscal responsibility would be recommended by the respective sports committees and approved by the full Executive Committee. The sports committees were then directed by the championships committee to submit reports for review, outlining the financial guarantees or guidelines that are to be used.

All of the governing sports committees reaffirmed the provisions of the current Executive Regulation 1-14-(b)-(3) regarding site selection, which are: the quality and availability of the facility that the host school is proposing, be it on campus or off campus, and the necessary accommodations that are necessary to conduct that championship; revenue generating potential, and finally, the geographic location of the proposed host site. Now, these are taken in no order of importance. All three of these will be considered as you submit bids to host NCAA competition.

In addition to sports committees this past year, men's soccer and women's basketball established minimum gross ticket sales and maximum expenses as financial requirements that host institutions must meet in order to host competition in those championships. Those were the only committees that opted to do so, men's soccer and women's basketball. There now are minimum financial guidelines that you must guarantee if you are interested in hosting one of those championships.

The topic of advancement was covered a little bit this morning. That opportunity for Division II student-athletes to advance to the Division I championship is an "evergreen" issue; it has been reviewed here the last couple of years. As a reminder, the Executive Committee determined in August of 1987 that advancement opportunities for incoming freshmen would be eliminated. However, as you also are well aware, there have been several attempts, primarily on behalf of Division II—because Division I and Division III are both opposed to advancement—to repeal the Executive Committee decision. Division II has been the only division on record as favoring this. We have tried to repeal it since then. It will be reviewed again at this Convention in Proposal No. 105. During our December meeting, the Division II championships committee endorsed this proposal.

The subject and conduct of weekly polls and the appropriate

relationship between polls and the selection of teams and/or individuals for NCAA championships was reviewed last August. We have had some problems with polls as they relate to the selection of teams. There was a suggestion that all polls be limited to 10 teams only, with a list of others receiving votes in order, to alleviate the misinterpretation of the relationship between polls and the selection process but still provide national visibility. Division II opposed the reduction in the number of teams being ranked and directed the sports committees that currently conduct weekly polls to stick with the top-20 rankings in their respective sports. However, it should be emphasized that the ranking of a team shall be based on won-lost records and strength of schedule and that differences may exist between the rankings and the selections as a result of format, bracket size, minimum and maximum regional allocations, automatic qualification and/or eligibility of teams or student-athletes.

If you are ranked, for example, in the top 10 in soccer and soccer only has a 12-team tournament, that does not mean necessarily that you are going to be part of the tournament. If the men's basketball committee ranks 20 teams and you are the 18th-ranked team, that does not mean necessarily that you are going to be part of the 32-team tournament; because there are other factors to consider. The reason people wanted to cut down the size of the poll was because of some of the problems that existed. You are ranked up there all year. Come time to choose the tournament teams, you were not selected. But, there were reasons for that, be it geographical, eligibility of student-athletes, so on and so forth. So, you have to keep those things in mind.

The committee also studied quite extensively championship traveling parties and squad sizes. They all were reviewed. It was determined that a request to increase either one would be addressed on a sport-specific basis with consideration given to cost implications and essential personnel, including the average size of coaching staffs for each sport, conference and institutional regular-season policies, and whether championships media requirements necessitate sports information personnel.

We also spent a lot of time discussing automatic qualification, reviewed many issues, and determined that denial of automatic qualification may be subject to appeal—first to the sports committee, and if that appeal is denied, then you would have the option of appealing to the entire Division II championships committee. In addition, we endorsed the concept that all governing sports committees be directed to issue a warning one year in advance to a conference that is in jeopardy of losing its automatic-qualification privilege. Now, if you are eligible for automatic qualification, you meet all the criteria, and during any year, you are kind of on the bubble whether you are going to get your automatic qualification or not, and you do subsequently get that but it's a very close call, the sports committee is required to notify you, one year in advance, that you are on the bubble, your automatic qualification is in jeopardy, and you should do whatever you can to improve the quality of competition within your

conference. They are not doing that right now; they could pull the rug out from under you from one season to the next.

The committee also approved a recommendation from the Division II football committee to implement automatic qualifications with the stipulations that a conference must schedule at least 75 percent of its games against Division II, I-A, or I-AA institutions with no conference member within the conference permitted to schedule more than two institutions not so classified. In addition, those conferences would have to have a minimum 500 winning percentage against Division II institutions. Now, this will be implemented in 1990 to give everyone playing Division II football in those conferences the opportunity to get their schedules in line so that they can qualify for automatic qualification.

There were some specific championship policy changes that were reviewed over the past two years. We reviewed many recommendations submitted by the various sports committees. Many of these were approved and some of them you know about, but I believe it will be of interest to review these briefly. In baseball, the bracket was expanded from 20 to 24 teams. In addition, the number of regions was increased from six to eight with the eight regional winners advancing to the championship finals. The committee accepted the proposal from the Women's Soccer Committee to establish a Division II championship. We had our inaugural tournament last fall with four teams.

Significant changes were recommended by the Division II Men's Basketball Committee, which were approved by the championships committee in an attempt to enhance that tournament. Specifically, the committee approved the realignment of various institutions to distribute more equitably the number of institutions in what the committee, meaning the basketball committee, perceived to be a better competitive bouts among institutions. Regarding at-large selection after the automatics are determined, the committee will place a stronger emphasis this year on regional representation with the intent of selecting, if at all possible, four teams from each of the eight regions.

However, if conclusive data is available, which means if there is significant head-to-head competition or evidence to support the fact, the committee reserves the right to select the best teams available, which could affect the number of teams selected from each regional. They would like to select four teams from each of the eight men's basketball regions; but if there are only two good teams in a region, or three good teams, and there are five in another and the evidence indicates that that is a clear-cut call that the committee can make, that's what will happen for the 1989 championship. The championship format was revised to advance all eight regional winners to the championship final in Springfield, Massachusetts.

Also, regional competition beginning the third weekend in March will be used to conduct the quarterfinals, semifinals, third-place, and championship games the following Thursday, Friday and Saturday.

You all know you have an extra week to play this year, and that will

be in effect the next few years until the new championship format is tried and tested in Springfield, Massachusetts. In addition, in men's basketball, the traveling party was increased from 16 to 19 persons. We also have tried to get some live or delayed television coverage through NCAA Productions, much the same as the women's Division I tournament will have this year.

We did another thing to enhance the Division II men's basketball tournament. We took \$100,000 from the block grant, put it in the receipts of that championship, which means that at the end of the tournament, when all the receipts are totaled, there will be \$100,000 extra dollars in there, which will result in—I don't want to say a much larger share of money coming back—a much larger amount of money coming back to the institutions. If you went to the final four last year, I think you received somewhere in the neighborhood of \$4,000 and change. If you make it this year, that will be increased probably to \$16,000 to \$18,000, depending upon how expenses are and how the regional sites do.

As mentioned earlier, automatic qualification will be implemented in football. Another thing we did with football was increase the size of the field this past year from eight teams to 16 teams in the Division II championship.

The committee reviewed the policy it had established regarding reimbursement for indoor and outdoor track. You all know what that was. You got reimbursed for indoor or outdoor; you couldn't get reimbursed for both. We had some problems in that you had to determine prior to either championship which one you wanted to be reimbursed for. That created some guesswork on the part of the institutions. We have modified that policy, you will be reimbursed for outdoor track. If you want to be reimbursed for indoor track, then it's incumbent upon you to notify the NCAA by February 15 that you prefer the indoor track reimbursement as opposed to the outdoor. There will be a form sent in time for you to respond by February 15. We have had a few problems with that. We hope that will straighten out.

In women's basketball, the field was increased from 24 teams to 32 teams last season. Golf was increased, not significantly, only from 38 to 39 players, but an increase, nonetheless. Women's softball field size was increased this past season from 12 to 16 teams. In men's and women's swimming, new events were added. The championship field was increased to 20 teams for volleyball. And I believe they also have what they call a "super eight" format for the championship.

So, virtually every sports committee that asked in the past several years with the exception of one—I believe that was tennis—received support for actions that in the judgment of the championship committee enhanced their respective championships tournament.

A few words about the block grant: The committee adopted the following policy regarding funding for the 1988-89 championships. We voted to pay 100 percent of the team and individual team championships transportation for 1988-89. As noted, participants in

the indoor and outdoor track championship will be reimbursed for only the championship of their choosing. Instead of retroactively paying per diem as we did last year, this year you will get per diem of \$25 a day at the conclusion of each championship that you participate in this year. It will be up front once all the receipts and the financial reports for the tournament are turned in.

In addition, transportation expenses will be provided for one nonathlete—could be a coach, trainer, whomever you choose—in the sports of cross country, golf, tennis, wrestling, swimming, and indoor or outdoor track. So for 1988-89, ladies and gentlemen, all your team sports, all your individual sports, all your coaches, everybody is fully funded in terms of transportation and \$25 per diem depending upon how many days they spend away from home.

With regard to the distribution of block-grant funds, the committee has adopted a philosophy, if you haven't already determined that, that instead of building a significant reserve of contingency funds, it's our judgment that the economic needs of the membership require that the funds be dissipated immediately. It's kind of what I call the Joan Boand philosophy, either use it or lose it. We didn't hold anything back, we spent virtually all the money that we had. However, I should caution you, that this will require the committee to scrutinize carefully the available funds to insure that we don't go in the hole from one year to the next. As I mentioned, very soon we are not sure as to how much money we are going to have.

Finally, the Executive Committee has established a special subcommittee to develop a policy regarding the distribution of financial resources among the divisions and to review the Association's priority in this regard. This committee is called the Subcommittee on the Allocation of Financial Resources. We have met once. We will meet again during the conduct of this Convention, and one of the issues in question is the source of funds for the Divisions II and III block grants. Whether you know it or not, the block-grant money comes out of excess receipts. The NCAA budget subcommittee, in July, sits down and prepares the budget for the upcoming year. Over here are all the expenses for enforcement, all the salaries, the travel, everything. Over here, are all the receipts—primarily Division I basketball tournament receipts. All the revenue that is generated. When they compare these two, if they determine that we are going to have excess receipts—we are going to take in more than we are going to spend—that's when Divisions II and III get their block-grant funding.

At this past budget subcommittee meeting, in July, we got \$1.5 million for this year. When we went to the budget subcommittee meeting, we were only in the budget for \$1 million. Obviously, that got my attention and we asked why. The answer was that we projected this much income, this much expense. That is all we have to give you. So, obviously, we objected to that. We maintain—Divisions II and III maintain—that we should not be funded out of excess receipts. We feel that we should be part of the budget, much the same as all the

other activities of the Association. So that is why we have formed this subcommittee on allocation of financial resources. We hope when this subcommittee concludes the couple of meetings that we are going to have that we are able to get our funding for transportation and per diem as part of the regular budget and not have to depend upon whether or not there are excess receipts at the end of the year in order to fund our particular teams and student-athletes in championships.

There is one other thing going on, and that is the special committee on membership structure that you have read about in The NCAA News. Ray Burse is on that, Jerry Hughes is on that and Joan Board is on that. And I think when that committee concludes its work, there may be some things in there as well that should benefit Division II as a membership division. There may be some things that come out of that committee, and I really can't say what, that you may like, maybe some that you might not like. I think the preliminary work of the committee would indicate that there may be some changes come out of that that overall would enhance being a Division II member.

It's been a couple of pretty good years, I would judge, for the championships committee with the block-grant funding and the things we have been able to do for the membership. We are up almost to 200 members. We had 200 members only once before; I believe that was in 1982. So with the four that we took in today, I think that gets us to 197, or something like that. If you have three friends in some other division that you can entice to come on down, please go ahead and do that.

That concludes the Championships Committee report, and I think these folks that are on that committee deserve your appreciation.

[Note: A verbatim record of questions and answers between a representative of the legislative services staff and delegates to the Division II business session regarding Bylaw 5-1-(j) is on file in the national office.]

Nominating Committee

[Note: The slate for Division II representatives to the Council and for Division II vice-president was presented. The slate was approved.]

OTHER BUSINESS

Richard H. Perry (University of California, Riverside): Mr. Chair, I'd like to rise to make a point. If I may, I would like to discuss an item that is not an item for floor action at this Convention but I think certainly is one that should have been. I must apologize to this body for not having done my homework as well as I should have either personally or at the conference level. We are very much concerned about the November 21 issue of The NCAA News, which describes the Division I men's basketball automatic-qualification changes approved by the Executive Committee. Our concern has to do not so much with the criteria for automatic qualification, but rather the process and manner in which it clearly, at least to us, appears to circumscribe the intent of bringing critical issues to this body.

For those of you who are not familiar with that change, by action of the Executive Committee, any Division II member institution choosing to move to Division I for automatic qualification in basketball, if you were to make a new Division I conference, you would have an eight-year waiting period before you could get automatic qualification for that conference. If you choose as an institution that's changing affiliation to join an existing Division I conference with automatic qualification, forget it. They will have to freely choose, because they like us so much, to give up their automatic qualification for a five-year period or the team that comes in, should it win the championship, would not be eligible to exercise the automatic qualification for an eight-year period.

It's my understanding that this action was taken on the basis that it was within the purview of the committee to do that, because it dealt with automatic-qualification criteria. I would submit to you that that action clearly is a response from Division I basketball people, to limit and deter and virtually make almost impossible the further movement of Division II people into Division I. My appeal to you today is to disregard the issue of movement from II to I. You may not have any conception at all or wildest imagination that you ever would want to make that move. The process is what I feel we have to challenge.

That kind of decision making, which so dramatically influences the good health of Division II, must be brought to this body for Division II and Division III consideration. We would encourage you on behalf of our institution and most of the members of the California Collegiate Athletic Conference to visit about this issue, about this process, within your conferences, discuss it with your presidents and chancellors. If you would agree with us that the process is indeed abusive to the Division II process, we would encourage you to notify the Executive Committee through your presidents and chancellors that you feel that way.

I apologize again for not having done our homework well enough to have brought a resolution in that would have allowed us to address this issue at this Convention. If nothing happens in the meantime, I will guarantee you that our conference will bring a resolution to the next Convention.

[The Division II business session adjourned at 2:40 p.m.]

■ Division III Business Session

Tuesday Morning, January 10, 1989

The meeting was called to order at 9 a.m., with Alvin J. Van Wie, College of Wooster, presiding.

OPENING REMARKS

Mr. Van Wie: The Division III business session is now in order. Let me take this opportunity to welcome you to San Francisco to the 83rd annual NCAA Convention. I think it is only appropriate that a long-suffering San Francisco Giant baseball fan is chairing this meeting in San Francisco. I hope that you have had an opportunity to enjoy the sights and sounds of this fantastic city and that now you are ready to go to the work that we have before this Convention.

The purpose of today's business session is to conduct not only the business specific to Division III, but to inform you of the activities and progress made by your Division III Steering Committee, Executive Committee, Championships Committee and Presidents Commission. Along with the reports of these committees, we will have a national forum on regional versus national championships in Division III, as well as other sessions that should be informative to you. It should be noted that this meeting has been planned by your steering committee in both its August and October meetings. It is the intent of the steering committee not only to inform, but to allow an exchange of opinions and ideas. I would like to emphasize that we want to allow you time today to exchange ideas. With 314 members in Division III, we realize that there is a diversity of opinions and ideas.

[Note: Various introductions and announcements were made, and the roll-call voting procedure was explained.]

DIVISION III FORUM

David Marker (Cornell College): For the next hour or so, or for whatever time we need to do this reasonably, we invite you to participate along with us on a discussion focusing on the appropriateness of national versus regional championships in Division III. As I was thinking about the program this morning, it occurred to me that this debate over national versus regional championships is an academic's delight. First, there is a spectrum of opinion on the question and no one has been able to find a golden tablet upon which is inscribed the right answer. Many, if not all, of the advocates of a given position are also finally ambivalent as they weigh such factors as time spent by athletes and coaches versus institutional and personal prestige, the academic needs of athletes versus the opportu-

nity for those athletes to test themselves against the best, expense to the NCAA and the college versus the quality of the experience for the student-athlete, and the commitment of time and energy for a runner to participate in a championship versus the commitments required for a football team to do so. Thirdly, in the very best academic tradition, it is theoretically possible for this debate to go on and on and on and on without reaching a totally satisfactory and satisfying conclusion; but as our chair has said, for this issue, probably, the time has come.

So this morning we have two distinguished, experienced, respected and thoughtful panelists who will sharpen our thinking in an attempt to move us toward a satisfactory, if not a totally satisfying, resolution as they present the cases for national and regional championships, respectively. After they present the cases in a few minutes, we hope you will join us in this debate.

Making the case for national championships is James Whalen who is president of Ithaca College. He is also past Division III chair of the Presidents Commission. Jim is known to many of you. He has held many important leadership positions in independent higher education. He was chair of the board of NICU and is just coming on as chair of the American Council of Education. During his tenure at Ithaca, several teams have been participants in national championship play. This past year, Ithaca won the Division III championships in baseball and football.

Making the case for regional championships is George Drake, president of Grinnell College and current Division III chair of the Presidents Commission. George also holds and has held more active leadership positions in higher education. George was a classmate of mine at Grinnell many years ago; so if you will pardon the personal reference, George is an outstanding athlete himself. During his undergraduate years, his performance was such that he was named a Rhodes Scholar. I'm also the father of a current Grinnell student; and I know that George, perhaps, has done more than any recent president of Grinnell in enhancing the quality of experience for athletes at Grinnell College.

James J. Whalen (Ithaca College): George Drake called me a few weeks ago and asked me to speak on the side of national championships; and since we had played in both baseball and football national championships this year, I hardly could say no. I certainly could not say no to my friend George; so, George, I hope you will read my lips and as we talk here today.

One of the great things about postseason competition is the fact that you do along the way meet wonderful people, new people, presidents, athletics directors, coaches; and you also have the opportunity to learn new jokes from other regions. One of the ones I heard this year I'll tell you this morning. It has to do with a young man who wanted to play football, but he wasn't doing very well academically. So, it was decided that the coach, the athletics director and the president would present this young man with an examination.

He was called in and was told he was going to have two hours in which to complete the examination. The coach's question was: How many days in the week begin with a T? He wrote it down. The athletics director's question was: How many seconds are there in a year? The president's question was: How many D's are there in Rudolph the Red-Nosed Reindeer? So off the young man went; and after two hours, he was called out. The coach said, "My question: How many days in the week begin with a T?" And the young man said, "Two," and the coach nodded. The kid said, "Yes, today and tomorrow." (Laughter.) The athletics director said, "Okay, how many seconds in a year?" The young man said, "Twelve." The AD said, "Twelve, how did you get that?" "Well, the second of January, the second of February, the second of March, the second of— (Laughter.) They figured that was pretty creative, and so the president didn't want to flunk him at that point. He said, "Well, how many D's, then, my question, are there in Rudolph the Red-Nosed Reindeer?" And the young man said, "Mr. President," he said, "that took most of the time, about an hour and 45 minutes of my two hours." He said, "But, I think I have it right. 214." The president said, "How did you arrive at that?" The young man says, "Well, D-D-D-D-D-D-D-D-D" (singing). (Laughter.)

There is little question that ours is a nation increasingly consumed by ratings and rankings of everything from posters to colleges, from football players to presidents. As someone who has spoken quite strongly in opposition to the rating of colleges and universities such as the US News World Report, the New York Times ratings and so forth, I may seem a little suspect as I speak now in favor of national championships. I do feel, however, that there is some value in national athletics competition and that there is a place for it in Division III. There have been many discussions about national championships over the years and the pros and cons of such contests in Division III. It is a complex issue, one involving questions of mission, cost and emphasis, among other things, all of which warrant some attention. Let me try to speak briefly to these questions and then to offer some observations.

When it comes to mission, I do not think that there is much question that the Division III mission statement does not preclude the existence of a national championship. In fact, there are portions of the statement that seem to support it, including a call to support students in their efforts to reach high levels of performance and the suggestion that Division III may encourage exceptional teams and individuals through postseason competition. You may recall a survey I did in conjunction with the NCAA Convention — Judith Sweet and Ruth Berkey assisted — a couple of years ago when I chaired the Division III subcommittee of the Presidents Commission. Fifty-nine percent of you responded to that survey in 1987. In it, we examined various aspects of the Division III mission statement and whether these elements accurately represented the present, then 1987, and whether they should be the guidelines of the future. More than 80

percent indicated that primary emphasis in Division III is given to in-season competition, perhaps a sign that there was not too much concern about overemphasis on postseason play. Further, 85 percent supported postseason championships for exceptional teams and 94 percent agreed that we should support students in their efforts to reach high levels of performance through means including appropriate competitive opportunities. The latter could stand in support of regional or national competition, but it is worth noting in either case.

There are matters related to national championships that if not dealt with carefully can result in situations not in keeping with our mission. I think it is important to talk about these and in so doing avoid confusing the baby with the bath water. There is no question, for example, that a national championship requires additional play-off games and contests that extend the playing season. In football, for example, I am concerned when our students have to play 14 games that take the season almost to final exams. However, to me, this is a question of length of playing season and more importantly the way in which the play-offs are structured.

As many of you will recall, we did not always have a 16-berth play-off for football. We even did not have always the eight-berth system that preceded it. When Ithaca College made its first Stagg Bowl appearance in 1974, it did so following a one-round play-off. In the next three Stagg Bowls, we had an eight-berth play-off; and then in 1985 and 1988, we participated in the 16-berth system. The rationale for the 16-berth bracket stems from dissatisfaction with the means of selecting play-off participants. The general feeling was that there were more teams in each region with comparable won-lost records than the eight-berth bracket could accommodate. In other words, we wanted more teams, more students, more institutions to participate.

We still have the ability as a division to define the ground rules for championship participation. If the present structure has created a season that is too long, and I believe it is, then let's again try to develop a structure that does a better job for us. We do not need to eliminate the structure altogether. In fact, in our 1987 survey, the championship format for football was identified as a top-priority issue for our division to address, while the question of regional versus national was seventh on the list. This suggested to me at the time, at least, that the people were interested in restructuring national championships, not eliminating them. There also are concerns about balancing academics and athletics, but that is an issue I believe we must address at the institutional level. Removing one tier of competition is not going to resolve the situation in which coaches are not monitoring carefully and encouraging their students' academic performance. Neither will it resolve problems associated with coaches who do not work closely with faculty on issues pertaining to missed classes. These are institutional issues and must be dealt with as such.

Cost is another concern; but again, one that will not be resolved by deciding to do away with national championships. The question is

how much to spend, from what source and is a matter for the Association and institutional review. For the NCAA, support of Division III championships relates to larger issues of equity in allocation of resources and cost containment. Some would argue that the Association would save money by eliminating national championship contests. Others would suggest that those savings and ultimately additional funds will be required to support multiple-site regional competitions. The NCAA must make a decision about what to spend on Division III, no matter what kind of championship we support; and all of us should participate vigorously in that NCAA decision. At home, as is the case with every other kind of program, chief executive officers must decide how much institutional support to provide for athletics. You and I may differ on whether to support championship participation, but at least we have the opportunity to decide. The elimination of a national championship simply reduces our options.

Having options is important for students, as well. There are three levels of athletics participation available to students in the collegiate environment. One is rooted in the curriculum, where by mandate or by choice students participate in skill classes in which they can learn to play or improve their general knowledge of a sport. The degree of involvement is moderate. For students who wish to participate beyond a classroom setting and who are willing to devote more time in exchange for dimension of competition and additional opportunities to play, there are intramural sports. Varsity athletics, the third level, is designed for the student who wants more exposure, in-depth training and instruction, and structured competition. It is designed for the student who has enough desire to warrant devoting significant time and extraordinary effort to fulfilling commitments on and off the campus.

If we are being at all true to our mission, then Division III varsity athletes are by definition participating in programs where academics come first, where the pressure of revenue production is not a factor and where financial aid, with or without Proposition 93, is need-based first. They are, however, varsity athletes and, as such, are no less competitive and no less desiring than their Division I counterparts of the opportunity to excel or to test the outer limits of their abilities; and I think they are no less deserving of that opportunity and the other benefits of exposure to other programs, travel to other campuses and interaction with other campus communities. Whether you win or lose, postseason competition in a national championship enhances exposure and opportunity. Divisional exposure is also important. Division III has not had a fair share of the nation's attention through media or otherwise. Outside of our institutions and our division, not too many people care much about our athletics programs but, instead, focus their attention and interests squarely on Division I. We will never overcome that fully, but we will take a definitive step backward by removing ourselves from national-level competition altogether. All of us strive for national recognition in many other institutional areas. I think we have to evaluate carefully what we gain by

excluding our athletics programs and our division from that opportunity.

There is value in national-level competition. At Ithaca, we have had national championships, if you will, in communications, advertising, scientific research, music, theater and a host of other programs, including intercollegiate athletics. All of it has served to enliven and enhance the institution, not so much because of winning but because of the additional degree of striving associated with trying to win. I would be hard-pressed to seek anything other than more of the same.

The heart of Division III, what makes Division III special, has to do with sound athletics programs in an academic environment. National competition does not jeopardize that. The way in which we choose to deal with national competitions is the key factor. Let me go one step further and suggest that national championships are not the issue at all. The nature of Division III is the real issue. No matter which way we go on the championship issue, some will feel the need to consider migrating to another division or even another association. The same may be true no matter what we come up with in our forthcoming discussion about financial aid. Perhaps it is time to consider seriously the possibility of another division to accommodate what are becoming clearly different schools of thought on many of these issues, rather than continuing to try and legislate a right answer for a very diverse group of institutional needs and perspectives. Thank you.

George A. Drake (Grinnell College): Jim, you are persuasive; but I think I still will try.

You may wonder why we have chosen to present this issue to you. As many of you know, this has been discussed in a variety of forums, including the Presidents Commission. A little later in this program, I will give you a report from the Presidents Commission, but I will tell you at this time that at our meeting in September the Presidents Commission voted to ask the NCAA staff to investigate the feasibility of regional championships in lieu of national championships, particularly in the sport of football. The Presidents Commission having taken such a step, it seemed important to share that with the membership and to lay out the issues for you; and of course, I think most of you already are aware of them. Our role is to try to refresh your memories and to sharpen them for our discussion this morning.

First of all, I'm going to present a sort of paradoxical argument by making the statement that athletics are too important to allow national championships. I think that there is very little, in the experience of our undergraduates, that is more important than athletics; and that, again, may seem a curious statement for an academician and president to make. I base this on what I observe. I base it on my own experience. Certainly as an undergraduate, nothing in my entire experience challenged me as much as athletics. Indeed, they threatened to overwhelm the intensity of feeling that I had toward competition in ways that other aspects of my life did not. I had a more difficult time managing my emotional response to being

an athlete than I did classroom or almost any other activity in which I engaged. Having to struggle through that in my own personal case and to a degree master the difficulties was one of the great growth experiences for me. You people in this room certainly are even more aware than I of the tremendous value that accrues to students from athletics. I'm anxious for those values to be extended as broadly and deeply into our student body as possible, to have as many students participate in athletics as can feasibly do so. And, I mean varsity intercollegiate athletics; because there is a quality to intercollegiate competition that is lacking in other forms of competition.

Many of our institutions have 20, 30, 40 and even 50 percent of their students involved in intercollegiate programs. That's a remarkable phenomenon. It's a phenomenon that we in Division III have that the other two divisions do not. What would it be in Division I, two percent, three percent of the students who are in varsity athletics? As an aside, that's one of the comments from Division I that I deplore. They talk about sports being for the kids. Well, if they really were for the kids, you would have a much broader participation. There are a lot of good athletes at the University of Iowa who don't participate in intercollegiate athletics; there is no way they can do it. That's not the case in our institutions. A person who has the interest and some modicum of ability can participate.

Well, how does this relate to the national championships? It seems to me that the press for national championships has a tendency to reduce participation and reduce the focus of the coach on all of those who are out for the team. If you are going to have a national championship or aspirations for a national championship, you must focus primary attention on the true quality athletes that you have and there isn't much left over for the others. I'm reminded of Kathleen Sullivan's comment at the luncheon yesterday. She must have been one of the others at USC and got very little attention. Now, I'm not saying that we would deny the training room to our less-talented athletes; but I see the focus on national championships as undercutting or tending—I won't say it all absolutely does—but tending to undercut one of the greatest values of Division III. I think we all subscribe to the value of athletics as being, in our institutions, to serve the needs of students. They are not there to serve the needs of our institution. Intercollegiate athletics, in my opinion, are there for the students as an opportunity to participate; and I fear that the quest for national championships tends to put the institutional priority ahead of the priorities of students.

Indeed, it could be argued that most of the problems with which we struggle are at least in some way related to the presence of national championships. Without that presence, we might not have the difficulties with financial aid and how it should be administered, the issues that are probably central to this particular meeting of Division III, Proposition 93 and its substitute, Proposition 46. We struggle with the issue of financial aid because there is a problem in our division of institutions gaining competitive advantage by the way in

which they administer financial aid. Nothing is easier at the present time, because so many of our institutions have such a high percentage of their total student body on aid, than to play games with the current aid policy; No. 93 is an attempt to make it very difficult to play games. I think there would be less temptation to play those games if national championships did not exist.

With respect to an issue that Jim raised, all of our divisions in the NCAA are heterogenous; but I think that most of us in Division III feel, and I would say even as strong as recognize it, that ours may be the most heterogenous of all the divisions. That heterogeneity, it seems to me, will come out during this day's business session. It may be that it is impossible for us to reconcile our differing approaches to athletics and the differing purposes to which they serve.

Well, I suspect—and this probably will make many of you angry with me but I will say it anyway—that if Division III dropped national championships and moved to regional championships there would be a division in Division III, and many institutions would leave Division III or form their own division in order to retain national championships. It seems to me that that may be one of the simplest ways of resolving what may be an unresolvable issue, rather than trying to stay together. I hate even to suggest it. It is not a very popular or maybe even a very appropriate thing to suggest to do, but it may be in the wind. I do believe that if this division were to vote at some stage to eliminate national championships and move to regional championships, many members would disagree and go to a division where they could have national championships. That, it seems to me, would separate those whose primary goal is to win national championships from those whose primary goal is to provide the maximum participation for students; and we might thereby have a more appropriate division structure relating to the structural issue.

Now, what I actually have said to date in this presentation could be an argument for no postseason play. There are, in some sports, real problems of length of season; and Jim explored those, I think, quite adequately. It is a somewhat separate issue from national versus regional championships. In many of our sports, it is not difficult to come out with national championships, I don't think, in terms of the time taken from students. So the argument, I think, is a complex one as it relates to sports. The most radical position, and I suppose much of what I have said would be in support of the most radical position, would be to drop all postseason play. I think a good compromise, halfway station, which allows many of the benefits that Jim described in the quest for national championships but which minimizes some of the difficulties created for the quest for that national championship, would be the substitution of regional championships where conference winners play each other on one or at most two weekends. I think that's the direction in which we ought to move in order to try to preserve as much of the value of national championships and to minimize difficulties that the national championships create. That's why the Presidents Commission asked the staff to explore

feasibility and potential costs in administering regional championships versus national championships.

There are other arguments that could be made, but I think many of you on the floor are more ingenious than I. I have kept a few back in reserve for discussion; but this is essentially the case I would make and please remember that the essential case is that if our intercollegiate athletics programs truly are for the benefit of the student, I am firmly persuaded that the limitation of national championships would, in fact, be beneficial for our students and broaden participation in our athletics programs.

Mr. Marker: Thank you, Jim and George. An excellent setting of the stage for discussion. Before we go to general discussion, Jim, do you want to respond to anything George has had to say?

Mr. Whalen: I think just on one issue, because I don't want to take time from the floor. I do think that having an interest in a national championship doesn't necessarily mean that it's an interest only in your school, that it's institutional. In other words, I would like to think that with most of us trying to be the best and striving to be the best is both for the athlete and for the institution, not just for the institution. I understand what you are saying, George, in terms of losing sight of that; but when I was talking about what I think is an important aspect of the national championships, I was thinking just as much of the student as I was of the institution. I think it can be good for both. I would agree with George that there has to be a balance. If it really becomes only for the institutions, then I think George is quite right; we shouldn't have it. I just don't believe that. We have had such wonderful experiences in participating in postseason play and going to national championships with a variety of schools that I didn't think we were out there pushing for the college, so much as we were participating with their athletes. I just thought I would make that clear, because I didn't want you to think I was concerned on an institutional thing. I think the student-athlete should have the opportunity for success in what I think is kind of a real world.

Mr. Marker: Now it's time for you to join in our discussion.

Mary Jean Mulvaney (University of Chicago): President Drake, I would like to ask if your reference to regional championships really is to team championships or are you including also individual championships such as swimming and track and field, where the individual goes rather than the team. I have a follow-up that I would like to ask.

Mr. Drake: Well, I will take the radical position and say it's to everything; but clearly, that would be a matter of decision for the membership because there are more problems in some sports than with others. The reason I say that, and this allows me to make a point that I didn't make in my presentation, is I'm a little concerned that the quest for national championships absorbs too much of the student's time in athletics. That certainly would be true of the endurance sports such as cross country or distance events in track and in swimming. The kind of single-minded dedication that it takes

to win a national championship, even at the Division III level—and I think we know in many of our sports the quality is quite high these days—it seems to me draws the students away from the fullness of participation in our institutions that they might enjoy if they didn't have that single-mindedness. Now, that's a little bit too much playing God in some people's minds. Some people just want to do that. I guess I don't want to stand in the way, but I would say that the quest for regional championships might be satisfactory in that regard. Let's say that my position is, across the board, substituting regional championships.

Ms. Mulvaney: Recognizing that fact, the issue probably has not been discussed on our campus and because both of you referred to the possibility of a new division, along those lines would it be possible at some point to take a straw vote just to see what impact this would have on our individual campuses?

Mr. Marker: The chair of the session says at the conclusion of this discussion we can do that.

Robert C. Deming (Ithaca College): I'm wondering, President Drake, if you could respond to the numbers issue as to junior varsity participation. On your campus, do you use that to get your number? In the NCAA, there is a concern about the number of people in broad participation.

Mr. Drake: We have JV participation in our conference when the numbers out for the sport justify it. For example, at our campus it's soccer, men's soccer. We have a lot of people in men's and women's cross country. In that sense, there is JV participation already. It depends on whether you are allowed to run nonstrong runners in a meet. But in football, we have a difficult time getting over 50 people on the squad. Everybody has ample opportunity to participate in the varsity games, but other institutions in the conference, which have larger squads, do have JV schedules.

Donald Harnum (Susquehanna University): I think that there are a couple of issues that have been alluded to in this opening presentation that probably challenge those of us who are in small private colleges, some of which are going to be out of our hands. The competition for the students at small private colleges over the next so many years, George—we have all heard so many times from our presidents and admission people—is going to be somewhat fierce; and when you have 1,500 students and the swing of 25 or 30 makes a major difference in your budget, I think we are going to have presidents who want us to be able to recruit at our level for students or athletes who would desire to have national championships as an option in their athletics competition. For those of us in small private colleges to lose that opportunity to attract those types of men and women who wish to compete on a national level, even those in Division III, would be a major disadvantage and one which I know my president, and the presidents of many institutions in our conference, would like to avoid. The issue that President Whalen referred to, which is the fly in the ointment of all this discussion, is

that of the heterogeneity of Division III. There are many institutions in Division III with larger enrollments that are not as concerned about a swing of 50 or 100 as many of us who have fewer students are. I for one, at my institution, at our level, would see great value in having two groups in Division III, both retaining national championships; because I think to try to stunt the competitive structure of athletics and lose that advantage in recruiting students would be something that none of us would like to see coming.

Mr. Drake: I certainly see the point of that argument, and I recognize that the possibility of becoming part of a national championship team or being an individual national champion could be a real inducement to enter a college and its programs. I think equally important is that the sports be available. If you take the broad perspective on admissions, and I have thought an awful lot about this as a college president because admissions occupies a lot of our time, you have the sports available to meet students' interest. So the ability to provide a large number of sports on the women's and the men's side is, I think, ultimately more important than recruiting the numbers of students that are needed; and I think there is at least some possibility at some institutions that the quest for national championships has to be a focus question. That is, we will pick one or two or three sports to emphasize for our national championship quest, which can, —though not necessarily will—diminish the other sports or even cause you to think of dropping sports. So I think you could make just as strong of a recruiting-a-student argument on the no-national championship side by keeping a broad, strong program across the board.

Mr. Whalen: I think the point you made is a good one. Congratulations, by the way, on a fine year, Don. I think that students do want to have an opportunity to compete at the highest levels. I think there is a real world out there, and I think you can have a real world in Division III without losing it. Let me tell you. We played Central (Iowa) in the Stagg Bowl game. I'm sorry Ken Weller isn't here at the moment, but that was a wonderful experience. I had an opportunity to know a number of the students on the Central team in those couple of days; and at the end of the game, after they had lost, at least a dozen of those young men came up to find me and congratulate me, personally. I felt that that was a real message about Division III, about the kind of competition we play at the national level and the fact that we were keeping it in balance; we were keeping it in balance.

Capt. James E. Foels (U.S. Coast Guard Academy): President Drake, we have about 60 to 65 percent participation in intercollegiate athletics at the Coast Guard Academy. Occasionally we have athletes, athletics teams, that are of such a quality that they are able to move on to the national championships; and I really would hate to have that opportunity denied. I would say that there are institutions that don't desire to participate in a national championship. They probably have that option right now to do so or not. I would be interested to hear a response to that.

Mr. Drake: Particularly with respect to your latter statement, I

think you absolutely are correct about that. There is a large number of institutions, probably in this room, where there is no particular drive for a national championship, at most some motivation just to qualify a few individuals for national championships. So you are right. In other words, we are free as institutions to make our own decisions under the current structure. What worries me is that you almost have to justify why you are not seeking the national championship. The momentum of institutional decision making seems to me to dictate that you ought to be thinking about national championships, and it takes kind of a self-conscious sort of self-denial not to go for it. So that's part of why I'm making it as a proposition for the entire membership. As for the first part of your statement, I think that's remarkable and wonderful. It sounds as though you are able to live in both worlds and do so quite successfully. I'm not sure all institutions do or can, but that is a remarkable record.

Sam Freas (Kenyon College): I think both presidents made very fine points. I would like to tell a little story, though. I feel like I was the father of Division III swimming. As a college division swimming coach at Allegheny College, I took 15 young people to California. It was the first time 10 of them had been on an airplane, and their eyes were as big as you could imagine. The learning experience through that national exposure was phenomenal. I really think that when we provincialize our thought process and championship process, we lose that learning experience. A good point was made that when we have a national type of orientation that perhaps we lose the participation. I can say happily as a Division I coach for the last 15 years, I kept Division III priorities and had 50 to 60 people swimming on a Division I swimming championship team that won the Southeastern Conference championship. I think it's an institutional situation when you have a coach that does not have the proper priority for Division III. But, the solution is not to go away from a national type of exposure. Rather than further division in Division III, we really should go to the sports committees and say, "Folks, come up with a better method." Let's not have 14 and 15 football games. Let's not have a field of perhaps 32 in soccer. Let's streamline a little bit; and at the proper moment, I would like to make a motion to that effect, that we do go to our sports committees before we come back to the next Convention, streamlining this methodology so that we can really keep the priorities of missed academic time in the proper place.

Mr. Drake: I would make one response. Yours is a compelling statement. The response I would make, however, is that—and it's to the issue of parochial versus broad experience—if at Grinnell College we were truly focusing on national championships, we could inhibit the breadth of experience of our students. Forty percent of our students study off campus for one semester or a year, most of them abroad. The coaches have fits when their students decide to go on a foreign-study program, but there is no question where the priorities are. The kids go on the foreign-study program. It is disruptive to our athletics programs, particularly the winter program where you have

a person for a half year, half the season, and not the other half. You don't really know what you are dealing with. Forty percent of our students are going off campus. You can guess that an awful lot of athletes are affected. I think that if we were focusing on national championships, there would be a lot more persuasiveness that the coach could exercise to hold those students on campus, to prevent them from having those opportunities. In our case, I think we have a more cosmopolitan experience, rather than less by not being particularly interested in national championships.

Rocco J. Carzo (Tufts University): What benefits have accrued to Ithaca College, having won national championships, that would be unavailable to you had you won regional championships?

Mr. Whalen: I think the national exposure was very helpful over the years. I arrived there in 1975, 14 years ago; and Ithaca had played in a national championship. It certainly spread the word about Ithaca College. I have watched over the years. Regional championships certainly would help the school regionally, but I think that we did get national recognition. We do have students from other parts of the country, to some degree. I'm not going to tell you that that's because we have had good football teams or good baseball teams; but to some degree, I believe the intercollegiate athletics program does have a very, very strong impact on recruitment, on the attention that's brought to the institution. We were very regional, very state oriented. I think that we have been helped by the national exposure and by a lot of things, good academic programs, as well. But, I think there is a real balance.

One of the concerns I have about this discussion is that it seems to me that you can have good athletes and good academics. You can have both, given a balanced program. We have a good number of our students who go to our London center. The quarterback on our football team is a physical therapist. He has decided he is going to play football, but he is not going to practice one-and-a-half days a week because of his labs. I like that balance. I like the student who goes to the physical therapy program in the fourth year and simply walks away from athletics. That's balance. But, the championships have helped us. For each of the students who come to us, there is another student somewhere, a friend of that student, who hears about us. So let's keep things in perspective.

George, I think, makes a good case in terms of regionals. I'm trying to make a good case in terms of nationals. I think, however, that there is a real world out there. I agree with the gentleman from Allegheny; students want to try to be the best. To be the best chemist, you are going to go all out. You are going to be a good student-athlete; you are going to go all out in athletics and academics. So I see nothing the matter with national championships; and I think that if we tried to do away with them and went simply to regionals, there would be a push right back to the real world to find out whether the regional here is better than the regional over there.

Mr. Van Wie: Thank you, President Marker, President Whalen

and President Drake. That was an excellent presentation. Let me say this: At our last session today, we are going to open up the floor for further discussion on any issue that you would like to discuss, and those people who did not have a chance to come to the microphone at this time will have an opportunity at that time to continue the discussion. I also would like to encourage you to take this issue back to your campus. Mary Jean mentioned that it had not been discussed on her campus. Discuss it on your campus. Discuss it in your conference. Our conference at our presidents meeting had an excellent discussion on this topic, and I think both President Whalen and President Drake did an excellent job in making many points that will give us a great deal of thought. This will be one of the main issues that we will discuss in the steering committee during the coming year. As President Whalen said, one of the joys of our association together is the new friends that we make. I think this has been one of the most satisfying things for me in my service on the steering committee and the Executive Committee, meeting new people and making lasting friends and really coming to respect people with different views.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEE

Mr. Van Wie: It's my pleasure at this time to introduce some of my colleagues who will report on the various workings of our committees.

Division III Steering Committee

Mary R. Barrett (University of Massachusetts, Boston): These remarks are designed to acquaint you with the Division III Steering Committee. There are many questions asked: Who is on the committee? What does the committee do? These brief remarks are designed to acquaint you with what we are doing. The NCAA Council is charged with the establishment and direction of general policy of the Association in the interim between Conventions. It consists of a total of 46 members from the three divisions. The full Council meets as a whole unit and also subdivides in a federated approach to form division steering committees to deal with matters specific to each division. There are 11 members of the Council from Division III, and they are identified as the Division III Steering Committee.

[Note: The members of the Division III Steering Committee were introduced.]

What does the Division III Steering Committee do? The Division III Steering Committee considers and acts upon matters relating to Division III and reports its actions to the full Council. The Division III Steering Committee plans and conducts the business sessions at the Convention. It meets with total Council and as a steering committee prior to, during and after the Convention. It also meets during Council meetings held in April, August and October of each year. One of the main responsibilities of the steering committee is to review legislation for Division III, as well as to propose new legislation as needed. During this past year, the Division III Steering Committee has met and addressed a significant number of concerns. From

Division III Business Session _____ 213

reading your Convention program, you can identify the pieces of legislation that we directly sponsored or that we have requested the Council as a whole to sponsor. We have conducted lengthy discussions and have proposed legislation on such topics as financial aid concerns, flexibility in dealing with the transfer rules, as well as refinement of legislation dealing with playing seasons and championships.

In addition to our extensive legislation activity, the Division III Steering Committee at its regular meetings has addressed the following: Membership concerns involving legislation interpretation, requests for new memberships, and membership waivers reflecting specific concerns and/or problems of individual members. We have made committee appointments; reviewed Administrative Committee actions, especially as they affect Division III; reviewed the Presidents Commission's activities as they impact Division III, and reviewed the Legislative and Interpretations Committee's activities that have impacted Division III. We have conducted surveys of members. We have addressed the concerns of members relating to provisions of the constitution and bylaws, and we have responded to the informational needs of the Division III membership. This Division III Steering Committee has had a very busy year. Next year's work will begin immediately following this Convention. We will gather as a Council to review the legislation passed, analyze the changes that will occur and plan to implement the committee, staffing and programmatic needs associated with the newly approved legislation.

The Division III Steering Committee welcomes communications from the membership and generally attempts to be responsive to your needs and your interests. It is particularly important that you are able to identify the steering committee members and that you contact them and identify your concerns. Members are encouraged to read *The NCAA News* and be alert to openings that occur for Division III members on committees within this Association. Please don't hesitate to contact your steering committee members and identify your interests, as well as your availability to serve. Quite frequently, the steering committee is asked to make recommendations and appointments when vacancies occur. Since usually there are demographic considerations that must be satisfied to balance representation, it's very important to be able to identify our available constituents.

I hope that these remarks have been informative and that they have given you an overview as to who the Division III Steering Committee members are and what they are doing. I encourage you to stay in contact with your steering committee representatives who certainly welcome hearing from you.

Executive Committee

Royce N. Flippin Jr. (Massachusetts Institute of Technology): I will try to be helpful by describing the structure of the NCAA Executive Committee and your representatives who serve. We meet

three times a year—May, August and December—with the responsibility to transact the business and administrative affairs of the NCAA, including the adoption of budgets and the management of income, expenditures and audits. The Executive Committee also conducts and reviews, through staff liaisons, all NCAA championships and tournaments. The three NCAA division championships committees report directly to the Executive Committee. Finally, and equally important, the Executive Committee formally employs and supervises the NCAA executive director and with the executive director oversees all NCAA staff personnel policies and practices including remuneration, benefits and career-development opportunities.

The structure of the Executive Committee with a total of 14 people includes at least three women. Five of the 14 include the president and secretary-treasurer of the NCAA and the three division vice-presidents. The remaining nine members are selected by the Council, of which seven are Division I and one each are from Division II and Division III. Judy Sweet's nomination for secretary-treasurer will give Division III a three-person representation on the Executive Committee for the first time in many years. Division III vice-president, Al Van Wie is our second representative and I am the third.

Now, some important Executive Committee issues or actions taken over the past year include: First, in the area of finance and budget, we approved the current year's operating budget at \$80.8 million. That's up only 1.7 percent from last year's \$79.4 million; and for comparison, last year's budget was an increase over the previous year of 38 percent. In the year just completed, the NCAA, as most of you know, realized a surplus of \$13 million in revenues over expenses. Of this surplus, \$3 of the \$13 million were allocated to Division II and Division III for the championship block-grant funding. With respect to the block grants, Division III started this fiscal year with \$1.5 million and with a \$292,000 carry-over for a total block-grant availability for us of \$1.8 million. We view this as a healthy position, which prompted the Executive Committee to take other actions with respect to Division III's block grant as follows: First, for the current year, we have agreed to pay, once again, 100 percent of all transportation expenses for Division III official traveling parties in team and individual championships. Second, for last year, 1987-88, as most of you know, we have agreed to reimburse, retroactively, all participants at \$25 per day per diem. Third, for the current year, 1988-89, contingent upon available block-grant funds at the end of the year, also to provide retroactively, again, a \$25 per diem for all participants in championships.

It should be noted here that your Division III representatives, with support from our Division II and Division I colleagues, have taken a very strong position on moving our block-grant funding source from the current surplus-funds category to a permanent line item in the approved annual operating budget. Division III is most hopeful for

this long-overdue change in status from what we might call a surplus-funds, welfare type of recipient to a recognized, vital component of the NCAA with a 1990-91 budgeted line item for Division III championships transportation costs plus equitable per diem support level.

Secondly, in addition to the \$3.1 million allocated to the Division III and Division II block grants from the surplus, over \$9 million from the surplus was allocated to the reserve of the newly created NCAA Foundation. The foundation funds, you should realize, are only from surplus funds. The objective is to raise \$50 million from outside sources. Just to refresh your memory quickly, the four highest priorities of the foundation include extensive research of athletics injuries, drug education and improved testing techniques, the selective funding of scholarships for student-athletes who have not completed their studies, and grants to ethnic minorities and women for sports administration graduate study. The Executive Committee is currently in the process of selecting the executive director, who will be the chief operating officer of the foundation. We are down to six finalists. There will be a cornerstone board of directors of up to 10 people who will select their own chair. The NCAA executive director will be the president of the foundation and will provide continuity of leadership and consistency in fund allocation. Finally, the NCAA Foundation offices will be housed in the new NCAA building.

The third area is drug-testing. The Executive Committee last month formed a special committee in response to an increasing need for more sophisticated monitoring of drug-testing methods and more laboratories to keep the NCAA effort on the cutting edge. The NCAA committee will interact with counterpart committees from the National Football League, the U.S. Olympic Committee and others. The current suspension of team ineligibility sanctions for positive drug-testing has been extended through the end of this 1988-89 academic year. Team ineligibility has been suspended once again. Finally, passage of Executive Committee-sponsored Proposal No. 6, which is in the constitution consent package, will remove the drug-testing consent form from the student-athlete in-season eligibility statement.

Briefly, other issues of interest: We have broken ground on the new NCAA headquarters. You have heard that from Executive Director Schultz. The lease was signed in November. We do believe it's an exceptional value. It will have an impressive visitors center, and there will be very attractive surrounding grounds.

For men's Division I basketball, a source of 75 percent of the NCAA's revenue, as you know, the Executive Committee has extended through 1988 the August 1984 moratorium of the 64-team field and maximum of 30 automatic qualifiers. For women's Division I basketball, the Executive Committee approved expansion to 48 teams from 40, with 19 automatics, effective through 1989. We did approve an amendment to the executive regulations that requires non-Division I institutions, which reclassify to Division I and form a Division I

conference, to wait eight years, formerly five, to become eligible for automatic qualification to the Division I Men's Basketball Championship.

Finally, and certainly equally important we believe, the Executive Committee and the Council endorses Proposal No. 9 in the constitution consent package, which will permit a member conference's full-time salaried women administrators and the member institution or conference's full-time athletic administrator who is a member of an ethnic minority both to be eligible to serve on the NCAA Council and the NCAA Executive Committee.

Mr. Van Wie: For those of you who are listening, I think we have made some real progress on the financing of our championships in Division III and not without a considerable amount of effort. We shall continue to strive to finance Division III championships, transportation and per diem out of a budget line item rather than a surplus.

It is now my pleasure to introduce Judy Sweet, who will report for the Division III Championships Committee. Before Judy comes up here, I personally would like to congratulate her and I'm sure you are going to want to join me. Judy is just completing her sixth year on the Council. She served for two years as a Division III vice-president and will be elected at this Convention as secretary-treasurer, the first woman to hold that position. This is a real honor for her institution, for Division III and especially for Judy. Rest assured, she will do a good job in that position.

Division III Championships Committee

Judith M. Sweet (University of California, San Diego): Thank you very much and I appreciate that. I'm pleased to present to you a report of the 1988 Division III Championships Committee. This February will mark the third anniversary of the division championships committee structure. Formerly, championships issues were handled exclusively by the Executive Committee, consisting of 14 members with two Division III representatives as a part of that 14-member structure. In 1986, when Divisions II and III championships funding was changed to allow each division to allocate assigned block-grant resources for championships, two five-member championships committees were formed for Divisions II and III. Division I used its eight Executive Committee representatives for its championships committee. The five-person committees consists of the division vice-president, the division Executive Committee representative, two division steering committee members and a member at large.

[Note: The Division III Championships Committee members were introduced.]

As this year completes my final year on the championships committee, I would like to express sincere appreciation to all of the committee members with whom I have served, including the initial committee members who really put the philosophy in place for the operations of the Division III Championships Committee.

In its inaugural year, the Division III Championships Committee focused on principles that would allow for equitable distribution of financial resources to all sports, rather than the Executive Committee's approach in 1985-86 of funding only team sports in Divisions II and III. It was anticipated that funds would not allow for full transportation expenses to be reimbursed, but that no institution should have to pay more than \$500 per sport for transportation. The Division III committee set as a priority goal efforts to restore full transportation payments for Division III. This goal was realized in 1986-87; and I'm pleased to report as Royce has indicated, that in 1987-88, even though transportation expenses increased \$300,000 from the previous year, the block-grant allocation not only allowed for full transportation payments to all institutions participating in NCAA championships, but also provided \$25 per diem for individual participants. In December of 1988, the NCAA returned to Division III institutions \$595,187.50 for 23,807 per diem days. Two hundred twenty-five of 314 member institutions or 71.7 percent of Division III members participated in at least one of the 24 Division III national championships in 1987-88.

With respect to funding for championships in the future, the Division III Championships Committee has set as its objective the provision in the operating budget of the Association for full transportation and per diem for all participants in all divisions and recently has submitted a position paper on this issue to the Executive Committee.

The division championships committees, which report to the Executive Committee and meet three times per year a day prior to the Executive Committee meetings, have allowed each division greater autonomy in establishing championships policies while also enhancing the efficiency of the Executive Committee, which relies heavily on the division committees' recommendations. The division committees also are able to focus more directly on sports committee requests and concerns. In 1987-88, the Division III Championships Committee worked very closely with all Division III sports committees in reviewing operating procedures, team and site selections, and applicable criteria for both. The intent was to enhance communications and understanding among the membership, the various sports committees and the championships committee. After surveying all sports committees and focusing on a philosophical approach that appeared to make sense for Division III, the Division III Championships Committee recommended to the Executive Committee that site selection for Division III championships no longer be determined solely by guaranteed revenue, or what sometimes was referred to as buying a championship, but that all institutions whose facilities met acceptable standards should be considered for the possibility of hosting. Other considerations in site selections would include geographic location, including accessibility, transportation costs, weather and potential for rotation of sites; seating when other factors are comparable, and attendance history and revenue potential as consid-

erations of importance but not sole or priority considerations.

The Division III committee reaffirmed the criteria for the selection of teams and individuals for NCAA championships and emphasized that the Division III philosophy relative to championships competition is to provide regional representation by allocating specific numbers of berths per region or by regional pairings and seedings, realizing that at times this may be done at the expense of leaving out some championship caliber teams. Further, the committee agreed that the emphasis on regional competition, both regular-season and within the initial rounds of the national championships structure, is cost-effective, educationally sound in terms of limited missed class time, generates increased interest in regional rivalries and is consistent with the Division III philosophy in general.

The Division III Championships Committee in 1988 further reviewed the concepts of sports polls and received Executive Committee approval on a two-year trial basis to allow football to conduct regional polls, rather than a national poll. Early reports suggest that this change in football has been well-received by both the membership and the media. Additional action taken by the championships committees and Executive Committee was to implement a one-year warning to conferences in jeopardy of losing their automatic bids, rather than immediate cancellation of automatic bids as had occurred. Other issues currently under discussion include increasing honorariums to institutions hosting championships to reflect more appropriately the time and resources donated by host institutions.

In summary, specific duties of the Division III Championships Committee appear on Page 281 of the 1989-90 proposed NCAA Manual, and the organizational structure depicting committee relationships appears on Page 18. I am hopeful that the information provided is useful to the membership in accessing avenues to voice opinions, concerns and suggestions. I would like to emphasize how important it is to the effectiveness of each committee to hear from the membership. Correspondence to sports committees with copies to the championships committee aids both committees in working jointly to respond appropriately. In conclusion, I would like to thank all of you who have communicated with the championships committee and helped us in trying to do what is right for Division III. I have enjoyed and gained from our interaction and hope to continue such interaction in the future.

Mr. Van Wie: Again, I would like to reemphasize what Judy said. Most of the actions taken, most of the discussions made, in the Division III Championships Committee came directly from correspondence with you, the membership; and we will continue to react in that way.

Reporting for the Presidents Commission is President George Drake, Grinnell College. I would just like to thank him for his help and guidance this year. We have worked together closely. I also should mention that President Drake is a favorite of ours at Wooster College, as he provided us an outstanding son. Chris was a fine soccer player,

captain of our team and a campus leader. After listening to his presentation this morning, I found out that the apple didn't fall very far. I found out where Chris found his desire.

Presidents Commission

George A. Drake (Grinnell College): I am an historian and I am going to give you just a little bit of history. This is, I believe, the fifth year of the Presidents Commission. I have been with that organization from the beginning. You will recall that it was created really as a compromise effort. There had been forces outside of the NCAA that had put pressure on the organization to change its structure and to insert presidential leadership more firmly into the representation at the NCAA. Now, as an Association, we didn't particularly appreciate that; and we feel, and I certainly feel, that the sovereignty of the organization as it is structured is very appropriate. However, we did create a commission of presidents in order to enhance presidential involvement; and it was particularly, we thought, necessary in Division I, though, of course, it's also necessary in all three divisions, ours included.

We have been feeling our way for five years. I think on balance the Presidents Commission has been a positive force in the NCAA. One of the difficulties that we have is in trying to mesh the work of the Commission and the Council, and I would say that the Presidents Commission has not always been as attentive to the importance and prerogatives of the Council as it might be. I am happy to say that I don't think this has been a Division III problem. For example, as many times as possible, particularly at this, our national meeting, we, the Commission, invite the Division III vice-president to sit in with us as Al did at a meeting on Sunday. So, it creates a very effective and positive liaison between structures within the organization. I believe at the Division III level that we have a very constructive and positive working relationship.

One of the values of having created the Presidents Commission and the method of service on it is that we are cycling our presidents through that body, which gets them more involved in the activities of the NCAA. By now, there have been about 20 of our college presidents who have served on that body.

[Note: The current and oncoming members of the Commission were introduced.]

I'm glad to say we had 10 of our 11 presidents at the meeting, along with Al Van Wie, just a few days ago.

Let me report on just a few of the items that we considered. At this particular meeting, in conjunction with the national Convention, we discussed at great length, obviously in the total Presidents Commission as well as our division subcommittees, Proposition 39. If you haven't heard, Peter Likins will, in fact, move to withdraw this proposition at this Convention and to substitute a resolution that would create a committee under the chairship of Wil Bailey to analyze the totality of cost control in college programs, particularly

Divisions I and II. It (the committee) will not be confined simply to financial aid but to other cost-control measures. There will be—if this resolution is approved and a committee is created—two Division II members of a 17-person committee. One would be a college president—and the Presidents Commission is strongly suggesting it be a member of the Presidents Commission—and the other would be an athletics director. Now, in our Division III subcommittee discussion, we speculated whether it was necessary to have anybody from Division III on that committee. Essentially, Division III is a spectator and an observer. Having been through this all year, it's very, very difficult to try to comprehend the financial aid policies and other financing policies of Divisions I and II athletics. But, in any case, we finally concluded, the Presidents Commission did, that it would be a good idea to have two interested observers who can, if for no other reason, interpret and report back to us.

The Presidents Commission also at this meeting passed a resolution. We will have to say it came in response to national legislative efforts calling for a full disclosure of graduation rates of athletes and the totality of graduation rates in universities and colleges. Again, this is predominantly a Division I and Division II issue. In our subcommittee, we discussed whether we would recommend to the full Presidents Commission that Division III be excluded in the revelation of these statistics, largely because many of us do not keep the statistics now. Our conclusion was that we ought to be a part of this resolution and oblige ourselves to make those matters public (a) because we should not try to exempt our particular division from the entire membership and (b) because it would be useful information for us to have. Many of us can easily recover those data; others will have a greater difficulty in tracking it. We suspect that the story that Division III can tell will be a very good story of at least comparable and in some cases even better graduation rates for athletes than for the totality of student bodies. The way the resolution is framed, it calls on those institutions that already keep these statistics to reveal them, make them public immediately, and calls for legislation in 1990 to mandate that the entire membership keep these statistics and make them public.

We discussed a variety of legislative issues that are before us and I will comment on only one. With respect to Proposition 46 as a substitute for Proposition 93 last year, the vote was three in favor of the change, that is to going to 46, and seven against, or in other words, in favor of 93. So, for what it's worth, the presidents are split on this issue but with a rather strong numerical majority for trying out Proposition 93.

Two matters from our meeting in the fall and then I will finish: One I already have mentioned in my earlier presentation to you, namely that the Presidents Commission has asked the staff of the Association to explore the feasibility of regional in lieu of national championships; and the staff has responded that it will do so. The other is to ask the NCAA staff to make a study of Division III championships over the past five years, champions and runners-up, and correlate that—those

champions and runners-up—with institutional size. This related to the old issue of whether there is an advantage to the very large institutions in our midst, vis-a-vis the very small institutions in our midst. We have been around that track a lot of times in this Association, but the Presidents Commission's lone contribution to that particular discussion is to get some facts. Let's see some data. Let's see whether, in fact, institutional size does create advantage; and then we can argue a lot about whether it's an unfair advantage.

Nominating Committee

[Note: The slate for Division III representatives to the Council was presented. The slate was approved.]

[The Division III business session was recessed at 10:40 a.m. and reconvened at 10:55 a.m.]

PROPOSED AMENDMENTS

[Note: The chair explained the procedure for consideration of proposed amendments, speaking and roll-call voting.]

Financial Aid Package—Division III

Edward G. Coll Jr. (Alfred University): Mr. Chair, I move the adoption of Proposal No. 46.

[The motion was seconded.]

When I assumed the position of one of the representatives of the Presidents Commission a year or so ago, Jim Whalen suggested to me that it was my turn to be in the barrel. I thought that was a figurative explanation until August rolled around and the reality of Proposition 93 fell upon my desk. There were numerous telephone calls and correspondence that I have had with presidential colleagues, particularly throughout my region and to some extent other regions. Clearly, Proposition 93 has caused some great concern and great anguish for certain members of our Division III family, among them some of the most academically distinguished institutions within Division III, institutions which by the way hardly ever participate in national championships programs in the primary sports of football and basketball and have worked hard over the years to provide a balance between their academic mission and the extracurricular activities of athletics. But the anguish with Proposition 93, they felt, was the fact that there was so much conflict that involved institutional decisions, institutional decisions that may have involved long-term strategic plans, the demographics and balance of admissions plans, the possible discrimination against certain students within their student body who might happen to involve themselves in athletics. Probably more, and most appropriately, is the fact that several of the schools felt that the NCAA actually was trying to establish admissions policies for their institutions. So we are confronted with what I think to be a very serious situation in how we interpret and how we affect the concept of Proposition 93 at many of the private institutions within the Division III fabric.

I think I should point out that even with all the anguish that was directed toward me by these presidents and other athletics directors,

there was an underlying sense that they all wanted to support the concept and principles of the NCAA. Again, they did not object to the basic philosophy that is inherent in Proposition 93 that we create a better balance between financial aid provided to athletics and financial aid provided to other students on our campuses. No one was really in conflict with that. The conflict really is derived from the interpretation as to how we inaugurate Proposition 93 into our working operations within the campus. Clearly, there have been a number of different variations and interpretations that have clouded this issue on Proposition 93. That has not helped in terms of my conversations with these people, because I simply have not been able to give them the kind of information that was factual and to the extent that would be helpful to them.

So, in sitting down and trying to resolve this dilemma with certain of my colleagues, we came up with two propositions. One is Proposition 45, and the other is the one we are going to vote on today—Proposition 46. We have rejected Proposition 45 because that puts us back to the pre-Proposition 93 era, and we simply don't want to do that because of the overwhelming vote in support of the concepts involved in Proposition 93. So, we come before the group today with Proposition 46, which places, certainly, limitations on athletics as they involve our Division III membership. It tries to underscore some of the philosophy that there has to be balance between academics and athletics and, again, tries to support the basic concept of Proposition 93. We don't suggest either, Mr. Chair, that Proposition 46 should be the final chapter in this continuing discussion and investigation. If Proposition 46 passes and if it's the will of the delegates and the will of the Council that we, again, should inaugurate another committee to study this matter further and then bring it back for debate at the next Convention with further modifications of this program consistent with the basic philosophy of Proposition 93, the sponsors of Proposition 46 have no objections to that and, indeed, endorse that type of concept. But, clearly, we have a major problem here, and it's going to exacerbate itself if some relief is not provided to these institutions that are involved. Please understand, for those of you who support Proposition 93, that we do not oppose the basic concept of Proposition 93. It is simply that we need some relief in terms of how we interpret this and how we execute it on our campuses; how we embody it into the basic admission policies of our institutions.

William A. Kinnison (Wittenberg University): I would like to speak in opposition to Proposition 46 for two reasons. Basically, first of all, Proposition 93, which was just passed a year ago and just went into effect, really has not been given any opportunity to be in effect prior to the submission of amendments already to reverse an action taken by an overwhelming majority just one year ago. The second reason is that Proposition 93 was drawn up after we had surveyed all of the members of Division III and represented the overwhelming point of view of members of Division III, as was reflected in the 3-to-1 vote. So I would think we ought, if anything, refer this kind of an

issue to that task force that is going to be looking at governance. I think to have amendments to propositions before they have even been put into effect so that you can test whether they are going to be effective and work out is probably one of the evils in the NCAA system. There is, year after year after year, a constant debate of issues that you think you have resolved; and before you have had a chance to put it into practice, you have another amendment for change. So, for those reasons, I speak in opposition to Proposition 46.

George M. Harmon (Millsaps College): I speak on behalf of the Division III Steering Committee, which voted 9 to 1 in opposition to Proposition 46. Prior to enactment of Proposition 93, it was clear that some institutions did take athletics ability into consideration in the composition and quality of financial aid packages for high school athletes being recruited for admission in the hopes that they would contribute to the athletics programs at those institutions. Other Division III institutions felt that to do so violated the basic philosophy of Division III athletics. Clearly, an argument can be made that to rule out consideration of athletics ability discriminates against athletes, especially if at the same time the institution is favorably considering other nonscholarly or nonacademic factors such as musical or artistic ability, student leadership, and so on. Likewise, an argument can be made that a diverse student body is desirable and that taking athletics ability into account in the composition and quality of financial aid packages facilitates achievement of the athletics dimensions to the class. Just as clearly, an argument can be made that an overriding factor in Division III philosophy is that athletics ability should be omitted from consideration in the construction or design of financial aid packages for all students being recruited; the point being that academic, artistic and other nonathletics-leadership traits are what we are about, not athletics, at least as regards financial aid or, more specifically, the financial subsidization of athletics ability.

Over the two- or three-year period prior to enactment of Proposition 93, members of the steering committee repeatedly received requests from the membership to propose legislation that would remove athletics ability as a factor in the design of financial aid packages for prospective students. The subject was discussed repeatedly at annual meetings, in subcommittees of the steering committee and in the full steering committee. President Kinnison has alluded to the survey that was conducted. As a result of such discussions last year, the steering committee responded to the membership and proposed legislation that for the first time clarified the issue. The membership debated and voted; and by a 70 percent to 30 percent margin, Proposition 93 passed. There is now no question about whether athletics ability is to be considered in the construction of a financial aid package for any student being recruited. Athletics ability may not be considered, period. An institution may take athletics ability into account in admitting students to the inclusion of any or all other factors it wishes; but in the construction of the financial aid packages

for any and all students, athletics ability may not be considered in any way, shape or form. There is no ambiguity on this point. It is significant to note that many institutions have operated effectively under guidelines comparable to Proposition 93 for many years. In doing so, they have attracted a diverse student body that has included athletes, and they have over the years fielded credible teams in the whole range of sports. Second, since Proposition 93 was passed a year ago, other institutions have modified their procedures and expect to do the same, attract a diverse student body, including athletes, and continue to field credible teams.

In opposing Proposition 46, the steering committee feels, first, that every institution that accepts the spirit as well as the letter of the legislation as currently is written will be able to make it work and achieve its various goals. Second, at the least, it would be reasonable to say that Proposition 93, which was proposed at the request of the membership, considered over a long period and approved by a 70 to 30 percent vote, should have a reasonable opportunity for implementation and evaluation of results.

William F. Elliott (Carnegie-Mellon University): As vice-president for enrollment with some 29 years of experience in admissions and financial aid, less than a year of experience in athletics, I also happen to be a trustee of the college board and have watched and been involved in the policies and procedures and involved in standardized testing and financial aid admissions for the past 29 years. Some of you may remember that I did attempt, at least, last year in Nashville to present a variety of points of view of admissions and enrollment people not represented in the NCAA. After we left Nashville, I followed very closely what I interpret to be the strict interpretation of 93 and was very much involved with initiating discussions with many admissions and financial aid people in Division III schools since that time.

There have been several results of those discussions. There is a thorough understanding on the part of many athletics people, as well as admissions people, about what was going on in the NCAA with regard to the self-help packages by which some of you operate. Your variable packaging is better understood, now. We also discussed the understandings of "gapping" or meeting financial aid but not meeting the full financial need of all people offered admission. There was discussion of admissions denied and offering admission but offering no financial assistance to such students. With regards to the variable-packaging question, we can variably package within financial needs, which is what 93 addresses. It is controlled, therefore, obviously, by the NCAA. As has been presented, No. 93 does make athletes what I would consider to be second-class citizens, when in fact within financial need, the areas of musical, artistic and other talents are taken into consideration. We also have talked about the issue of financial aid beyond need, which is allowed by the NCAA policies. Some of the abuses that have been talked about refer to these enticement awards that obviously can include students who, by the

way, happen to have outstanding athletics ability.

The conclusion of some of my findings are that the National Association of College Admission Counselors has no knowledge and little information about what is going on with Proposition 93, and a similar situation exists with the National Association of Student Financial Aid Administrators with regard to what is going on within the NCAA.

In Nashville, I talked a little bit about the enrollment issues that clearly face all of us in the 1980s. The philosophy and the policy, you may remember, of what I called access and choice, access to our institutions based on academic and artistic talents and choice based on the reality of financial aid, along with institutional autonomy and prerogatives to control the destiny of each of our institutions. The realities of the 1980s are understood well in the admissions office. In many cases, the salvation of many of the small schools represented in Division III from absolute and dramatic decline anticipated in the number of high school graduates is, in fact, the recruiting talents of our coaches. I have found that in many cases as many as 50 percent of an incoming freshman class can be attributed to the contacts and recruiting talents of coaches.

The problem then centers on the issue of variable packaging. Let me tell you where the real problem is; it is variable-needs analysis, which also takes into consideration athletics talent. What you have before you is Proposition 46. No. 46, which in many cases is needed by, quite frankly, a wide number of Division III schools in order to continue to operate within the status quo, does retain the integrity of the admissions and financial aid policies of many of your institutions. The other issue is one of enforcement. I don't know how that will work; I can't tell you. The fact is that there are large numbers of admissions and financial aid people that have discussed this issue. That's a question which, obviously, I guess I would leave to the NCAA to determine.

So with these issues in mind, I would encourage the adoption of Proposition 46.

Jim Scannel (University of Rochester): I am vice-president of enrollment, placement and alumni affairs. My colleague, Mr. Elliott, has no more time in admissions than I do, but he has one more year in athletics than I do. This is my first NCAA Convention. I have been a chief enrollment officer of three institutions, Rochester being the most recent; and I came to this Convention because I consider the issue of Proposition 46 to be an enrollment issue, not an athletics issue. The issue before us today has everything to do with admissions as well as financial aid. It has everything to do with an institution's ability, some institutions, not all institutions—I recognize that we are talking about a fraction of the institutions in Division III—to enroll the class it seeks, the student body, the undergraduate cohort, as well as the participants, the student-athletes. The issue before us has everything to do with institutional autonomy at a significant number, but not all, of Division III institutions. Let me briefly try to

explain why those of us supporting 46 are seeking your consideration. We are not lining up or trying to line up against 93 but rather trying to find a way to keep the spirit of 93 whole and create a vehicle within which all of us can live and work. Last year during this session, there was a good deal of discussion about what the mission charted in 1973 meant. In 1973, tuitions at most higher-cost institutions in this country was above \$3,000, about the price of a full-sized car. In 1989, full-sized cars are now approaching \$20,000 while our tuitions at the high-cost institutions are peaking at over \$10,000. Perhaps we should unleash the ex-secretary of education on the automobile industry, rather than higher education with those statistics. At lower-cost institutions in 1973, state-supported institutions had tuitions of maybe \$1,000, maybe less, maybe significantly less. In 1989, those low-cost institutions have tuitions of almost \$2,000. The ratio of high cost to low cost has gone from 3-to-1 to 5-to-1. More importantly, the difference in tuitions grew from a \$2,000 difference to an \$8,000 difference.

In 1973 middle-income students at our institution didn't qualify for need based aid, especially a need that would be scholarship aid. Today, with a \$14 million institutional-aid budget for 4,200 undergraduates at the University of Rochester, the vast majority of that money, because of the numbers, not the individual needs, goes to this new client group, middle-income students. For those of us where the need of our undergraduates far outstrips the aid available, even \$14 million, great pain is taken to decide who gets what and how much. Our aid policy is targeted to maximize our ability to attract and enroll the desired social-economic, racial-ethnic, academic and special-talent mix of students. We employ that strategy because of the numbers on aid and the aggregate need and too few scholarship dollars to fund everyone at the desirable level. For those of you from lower-cost schools, those decisions, that is where to put the money, are less major and I would think less painful. For those who work on campuses with higher costs, but with student bodies where the aggregate need doesn't exhaust all scholarship funds available, then your enrollment challenges are different. But at the University of Rochester, and a significant number of other Division III institutions, the process of enrolling a class, putting together a class that will provide the best overall educational opportunity for all involved, the targeting of institutional aid has become a necessary way of life. In Proposition 46, we are looking for a common ground to continue to allow us to enroll our class and at the same time compete equally with everyone in the athletics world.

Willard L. Huyck (University of the South): I think this is a clear-cut and basic philosophical difference between Division III on the one hand and Divisions I and II on the other. Either we have athletics scholarships, whatever we call them, or we don't. I think that contrary to what was just stated this issue has the potential to create or to maintain competitive inequity more than any single issue that we face. Now, if the sponsors of this issue are as pure and chaste as

the driven snow, which they well may be, it still opens the door for all kinds of abuse from people who are not, who are extremists in admissions, who desperately are seeking public recognition, national recognition, whatever you want to call it; and the potential is there for terrible abuse. I'm not persuaded that we discriminate in any fashion against the athletes. They still are eligible for the same kind of aid, need-based aid, that are other people. They are eligible for other kinds of merit-based scholarships, may they be a violinist, people with 1,500 (SAT) scores, or whatever they may be; and they are not discriminated against, in fact.

We already and willingly establish certain criteria that we specifically apply to athletics because of the competitive nature of our game. We don't allow professionals. We don't allow part-time students. We don't allow in our championships people who test positive on drugs to participate. In many ways, we have set certain criteria of credibility that apply to athletes because of the nature, the unique nature, of this business. I am concerned with the practical implementation of this proposal. Again, I guess this reflects, as I said, not only on the particular schools that sponsor this but on others. I certainly would like to see, if we are to compromise on 93 and put the camel's nose in and push it forward a good bit, public disclosure of who is getting these grants and whether or not we should have limits or quotas by various sports; because I will bet you that football, men's basketball and women's basketball are going to have a singular number of preferential packages.

Last, I'm concerned with the ambiguity and vagueness in the proposal. When I hear words like "closely equivalent," I wonder who is going to determine what is close and what is equivalent. I get uncomfortable. So it seems to me that we have a clear-cut choice. Regardless of what we call them, we want scholarships or we do not want them. I can see that a proper and full case could be made for this proposal because of the admissions crunch, because of the finances of our times. Maybe we have to go to scholarships, but it seems to me that it's not in Division III.

Lewis S. Salter (Wabash College): Last year, I rose to speak in support of 93, and I rise today to express opposition to 46. My hope is that the membership will continue to support 93. First, I'm not clear on just what is meant by the attempt to distinguish between the spirit of No. 93 and the ambiguity with regard to carrying it out. It seems to me, as the previous speaker made clear, the virtue of Proposition 93 is its lack of ambiguity. In response to the Division III membership and with some input from the Committee on Financial Aid and Amateurism, the Division III Steering Committee brought forth a proposition that endeavored to draw a clear-cut line. Now in the preceding remarks, there has been a good deal of talk about interference with the autonomy of individual institutions. I remember that the discussion last year on 93 made pretty clear the fact that the process of admissions needed to be clearly distinct from the process of awarding financial aid. Certainly, the Division III Steering

Committee and certainly the NCAA has no wish to interfere in the admissions policies of any member institution. We are simply saying, "After you have decided who you are going to admit, when it comes to the award of financial aid, don't discriminate in favor of athletes." We would like the kind of situation that those of us who go back to when Division III was created, in the mid-1970s, thought that we were living in, a world in which we were out of the situation of bidding for blue chips. Those people could go to Division I. Our athletics programs were to be genuinely amateur. No financial aid packages were to be shaded in favor of athletics. I say that is the great virtue of 93, that it makes that very clear; and I urge the membership to vote against 46 and support the total concept that was passed last year.

Bruce Bryde (Widener University): My remarks will be brief. No. 93 was put into place to curb the abuse of a large area of interpretation. No. 93 removed that blessing on the abuse. I would like to suggest that there is better legislation on the horizon, and No. 46 is not it.

Mary Jean Mulvaney (University of Chicago): I vowed I was not going to speak on this issue, but I do believe that there is a great deal of ambiguity on this issue. As I have talked with various institutions about their interpretations of No. 93, a literal interpretation of 93, I think there is a great deal of ambiguity. For example, our strict interpretation, as we understand it, is that if you give all students, say with a 1,500 board score or higher at your institution, a different package than you give those students below 1,500, that if one of them, or six of them in that group over 1,500 happen to be athletes, they cannot receive that award. This is the ambiguity that we are getting because you are making a different interpretation. We are interpreting it literally, and it says, "Any athletics participation." Our interpretation is that anyone with that 1,500 board score or over who is an athlete cannot receive the aid. That's why we are saying that we are being discriminated against, because they would not fall into that group.

Now, that, as I understand it, is the literal interpretation, as we understand it. I think that is where the problem lies, because I don't think we are all interpreting Proposition 93 the same way. We have tried to interpret it as we thought it was to be interpreted. No athlete's ability was to be considered. If you do not consider athletics ability, then all of the athletes have to be eliminated. That's the reason that we have been concerned and why we have brought forth Proposition 46, because then you eliminate that ambiguity. Now, maybe we are misinterpreting Proposition 93, but that is our understanding. So, in other words, any high school athlete is penalized at your institution. Am I correct in that interpretation?

From the floor: No.

Ms. Mulvaney: All right, then, let me ask a second question. If you have a rating scale or matrix at your institution and you say that all 10s—regardless of who they are and the 10s are usually 1,500s and above—and you say that all 10s get a certain package that is different, and in that group are athletes, am I correct that they would

have to be dropped out of the package?

From the floor: No.

Ms. Mulvaney: Well, that is not the interpretation that we have used. Then, we have misunderstood and that's the point I am making. I do not think there is the same interpretation by every institution.

Cheryl A. Marra (Denison University): I feel that Proposition 46 is discriminatory in nature. If a certain percentage of athletes are allowed to receive special packages, will all athletes actually receive these special packages or will it most certainly go to the football quarterback or the big man in basketball, which was alluded to by the president from Alfred? Does this legislation create the great opportunity for discrimination against athletes involved in other sports and specifically women athletes? I find it hard to believe that we are going to look very seriously at the women's field hockey or volleyball players at our institutions within that perspective. Proposal No. 46 opens up a great opportunity for a great deal of discrimination, and I urge you to defeat it.

Lewis S. Salter (Wabash College): To allude to Mary Jean's specific examples: A young woman in that list of 1,500 scores who deserved preferential financial aid on that account is there because she has a 1,500 score and not because she is an athlete. Secondly, take your matrix: all Proposition 93 says is that there ought not to be a row or column in that matrix having to do with athletics ability.

Mr. Van Wie: That is also the interpretation of the staff. That is the interpretation that has gone forward in correspondence from the Division III Steering Committee.

Judith M. Sweet (University of California, San Diego): I think I'm going to try to answer what I thought I heard Mary Jean's question to be in regards to what happens if the student is graded as a 10 in regards to the financial aid package. If athletics ability is a part of how they were rated as a 10, it's my understanding, based on the discussions that we have had, that it could not go forward in that form. If athletics ability is not a part of that rating, then it could go forward through the normal channels. I believe that that was the confusion that occurred last year in regards to some people feeling that once the evaluation was done in the admissions office, if athletics ability was a part of that evaluation it could go forward. The sense of the committee and the sense of this group last year, I believe, was that athletics ability could not go forward with that rating and that those institutions would have to determine a mechanism to pull out that rating on athletics ability and then the evaluation could go forward to the financial aid office. That's the first part of what I wanted to say in response to what I think Mary Jean was asking of this group.

On behalf of the steering committee, I would like to point out some of the questions that we have as a result of Proposal No. 46. It appears that preferential packaging is really the issue here. There is not a difference on need because need is based on certain established policies, but how that need will be met seems to be the issue that's

before us. The questions that we have are as follows: No. 1, Will all athletes be given more grant if preferential packaging is allowed? No. 2, who will evaluate athletics ability? Proposal 92 last year removed athletics staff members from having any influence on the financial aid package. No. 3, are participants in athletics treated the same or will some athletics participants who happen to be taller or faster be given more grant? Will some athletes be treated differently from other athletes? Will packages offered first-year students change if they choose not to participate in athletics during any part of their college career? Will the packages change if the athletes ultimately are faster or more successful in their sports than anticipated? How will this be determined and by whom? Will intramural athletes be treated the same way as varsity athletes?

Our feeling is that Proposal No. 46 creates more ambiguity and is in contradiction to what the will of this body was last year and we urge defeat of Proposal 46.

[Proposal No. 46 (Page A-32) was defeated by Division III, 48-187; roll-call vote.]

Division III — Cost of Attendance

William A. Marshall (Franklin and Marshall College): On behalf of the Division III Steering Committee, I move the adoption of Proposal No. 68.

[The motion was seconded.]

This proposal will allow a Division III student-athlete to receive financial aid related to transportation and other expenses incidental to attendance, provided the total value of all the financial aid received by the student-athlete does not exceed the cost of attendance normally incurred by students enrolled in a comparable program at that institution. Basically, this proposal will allow a student-athlete to receive many of the same types of aid received by other students. The members of the Division III Steering Committee support this proposal and I urge your support. A brief editorial comment: I think probably there are many schools in this assembly that have been technically in violation of the rule that exists on the books, presently. I think this probably brings that regulation in line with the practical application that most of you are using.

[Proposal No. 68 (Page A-67) was approved by Division III.]

Postseason Football Contests — Division III

Rocco J. Carzo (Tufts University): On behalf of the Division III Steering Committee, I move the adoption of Proposal No. 108.

[The motion was seconded.]

Because Division III institutions are not involved in postseason bowl games, it does not seem necessary to have legislation applicable to Division III regarding invitations to bowl games. This proposal would remove Division III institutions from legislation governing invitations to participate in bowl games. Therefore, I would urge your support.

[Proposal No. 108 (Page A-99) was approved by Division III.]

Transfer Eligibility—Division III

Lewis S. Salter (Wabash College): Mr. Chair, on behalf of the Division III Steering Committee, I move the adoption of Proposition 115.

[The motion was seconded.]

As you will see, this proposition impacts a good many of the present regulations; but the intent is very simple and the question before us is whether we want what this does. In the spirit of deregulation and in consonant with the Division III philosophy of encouraging participation, this proposal simply permits the student-athlete who transfers from either a two-year institution or a four-year institution to be immediately eligible for regular-season and championships competition upon transfer. It removes the need for written releases. For those worried about possible abuses, I would simply remind you that the students, of course, must be academically eligible according to the rules for transfer by the certifying institution. Furthermore, I would remind you that Bylaw 1-2(h) is still in force, which says something pretty strong about athletics directors and coaches contacting students at other institutions without prior permission of the athletics director at those institutions. Mr. Chair, I urge, on behalf of the steering committee, support of this proposition.

[Proposal No. 115 (Page A-103) was approved by Division III.]

Financial Aid—Division III

William A. Marshall (Franklin and Marshall College): On behalf of the Division III Steering Committee, I move for the adoption of Proposal No. 125.

[The motion was seconded.]

This proposal would allow a Division III student-athlete to receive scholarships awarded in accordance with Constitution 3-4(a)-(3) and (4) without consideration of a student-athlete's need. Constitution 3-4(a)-(3) and (4) scholarships may or may not use athletics ability as a criterion and typically are awarded by an outside organization to high school graduates. Such awards may not be awarded by a member institution, and the recipient's choice of institution may not be restricted by the donor of the award. Therefore, it does not seem necessary to have to include them within the Division III student-athlete's need package. An example would be something like this: Your local rotary club gives a young man or woman a \$100 scholarship because of their leadership, which may or may not include athletics, or because of their outstanding athletics ability. The individual can take that scholarship with them, apply it to whatever school they happen to attend and it need not be considered as part of their aid package based on need. I urge your support of this proposal.

[Proposal No. 125 (Page A-112) was approved by Division III.]

Out-of-Season Practice Limitations

Lynn M. Pacala (Occidental College): On behalf of the sponsors, I move the adoption of Proposal No. 135.

[The motion was seconded.]

This proposal would permit individual voluntary instruction between a student-athlete and one member of the Division III institution's coaching staff outside the established 21-week playing season. One of the basic tenets of Division III intercollegiate athletics is the commitment to meet the needs and the interests of students. The denial of a student-athlete's access to resources that enhance his or her educational-athletics experience when the season is over is as fundamentally wrong as the denial of student access to the library, laboratory or faculty interaction when they have completed an academic course. Proposal No. 135 insures that a student-athlete has the opportunity to secure the instruction and guidance of trained professionals in a sport should the student-athlete require it when the traditional season is over. Prior to the 1987 special Convention, this opportunity was afforded to all student-athletes. If we are true to our beliefs that sports participation is a hallmark of our educational objectives, it is essential you vote in favor of Proposal 135.

Robert R. Peck (Williams College): I would like to speak against this proposal for two reasons. I think we are opening the door, again, for very aggressive people to coerce students into practice times that they may or may not really want to participate in, where there will be organization for quarterbacks or other positions on a team to be involved on certain days. There will be organized scheduling, and there will be a lot of coercion. I think this would spread to other staff members who feel that they are not really doing their job if they don't do like coach X does for the squad. I think there will be comparisons between institutions. I also am concerned about the pressure on coaches who have other responsibilities, other duties; and it would seem unprofessional of them if they did not respond to students, at times maybe a great number of students, to give this individual instruction. I think it would be opening the door to a considerable number of abuses.

We have acted in our wisdom to put a limit of 21 weeks on intercollegiate athletics periods, and I think that that seems to be something that has been accepted by us. I think to extend this even on an individual basis would open up the possibilities for quite a bit of coercion and quite a bit of extra time that doesn't really seem to be necessary. Students can play on a voluntary basis with whomever they want as long as it is not an instructional period. That's what our legislation now says. So, I think we have good legislation on this and I urge the membership to vote against this proposal.

David A. Jacobs (Whittier College): I speak in support of this proposal. I believe it's a common-sense rule that has been involved in our conference for a number of years. One-on-one instruction out-of-season occurred for many years prior to last year's legislation. There are occasionally some minor problems with it. There is an opportunity occasionally for an overzealous coach to make it more required than voluntary, but I think it's an overall benefit to the student-athlete. The athlete doesn't understand when he or she comes to a professional and says, "Can you help me with a job" or "Can you help me with

volleyball" or "Help me with my free throw"; and you say, "No, we are not permitted to do that." I think in Division III it's a different philosophy. The paranoia and distrust that prevails in Division I and in some sense in Division II I hope doesn't prevail in this kind of division and our kind of philosophy. I think the real problem is what you can allow and control on your own campus. I think we should trust each other enough to know that each president, each faculty rep and each athletics director can run their own shop and that coaches can be encouraged and required to keep it on a voluntary basis. I think we have done that. We would urge this proposal to be passed.

Donald Harnum (Susquehanna University): Speaking as the president of the Middle Atlantic States Collegiate Athletic Conference, 26 colleges—we met in caucus last evening and discussed this, among other proposals—we are quite strongly opposed to this proposition and would support Mr. Peck's argument. I would also put forth as an institutional representative and in opposition to Mr. Jacobs' argument that we all know in trying to manage our athletics departments that there is a good percentage of overzealous coaches who will utilize such a loophole to semiorganize sessions in the off season. For those reasons, as an institution, we oppose it; and our conference, as a group, opposes this proposal.

Royce N. Flippin Jr. (Massachusetts Institute of Technology): I rise to say I really can't believe that Division III wants the legislation currently on the book. I say I can't believe it because I can't believe that we have to have it on our own campus at MIT. Our students, across the board, come to MIT wanting to get better athletically, eager to get better and better. I say that across the board. I have students imploring me to vote for No. 135 and to pass it, as well as coaches and administrators on our campus. I can't believe that Division III doesn't want a full-time coach in soccer, even squash or tennis, to have the opportunity of improving a soccer, squash, or a tennis player or a wrestler throughout the year outside the 21-week period. I can't believe we want to deny our students that opportunity. At MIT we don't want it.

I have a feeling, when you really boil it down, it's not the student we are worried about, although we bring it up that way; I really think it's somehow an attempt to wrestle with competitive equity. I think if we really came down to it and asked what our students want and can we manage what our students want—that's our job, anyway—I think we would say we would allow our students to interact on a one-on-one basis with our coaches at all times on the campus. Somehow this competitive-equity thing comes in; and therefore, it becomes an institutional issue. I think, frankly, it's not a student-athlete issue. What I am asking for is passage because I'm voting for the student-athlete at MIT and I think for Division III. I urge this body to pass 135.

George A. Drake (Grinnell College): I would like to speak in opposition to the proposal and, I would say, in favor of the student-athlete. I fear that opening the door to individual-coaching sessions

out of season may, in fact, inhibit the opportunity of student-athletes to participate in multiple sports. If, in fact, it is competitive to win a position—a point guard or a quarterback—or would it not enhance my prospects if I worked with the coach out of season and didn't go out for baseball so that I would become a better quarterback, I probably am going to do that. I think that could be one of the impacts.

The other reason is—I'm going to make another bold statement; I guess I'm prone to this—I think American collegiate sports are too coach-ridden. When you start coaching young men and young women at the seventh-grade level, eighth-grade level, you have pretty much taken away the spontaneity in our sports programs. Now, the out-of-season play that goes on in our campuses now, uncoached, is an opportunity to do your sport simply for the enjoyment of doing it without the control of coaches. It is student controlled. There is a lot of that that goes on on our campuses, and I think that's good. It gives the athlete a chance to express that spontaneity and love for a sport without the control of coaches.

Paul C. Hausser (New Jersey Institute of Technology): Fortunately or unfortunately, many of us have to operate with part-time coaches; and in that vein, there is inequity. It is a parity question that my students who have a part-time coach and who end their season would not get this additional training. Unfortunately, I don't have the revenue or resources or foundations or trusts that some of our other institutions have. I would love to have full-time coaches for every activity, and I feel it would be inequitable for my students to compete against a person who has had the additional training through the entire year. I encourage you to vote this proposal down.

William L. Huyek (University of the South): I wish to commend Royce Flippin on his comments, which I think are most appropriate, and then simply ask, if you were a member of a golf or tennis club for which services you had paid, would you choose to not have access to the pro other than 21 weeks of the year?

Mary Jean Mulvaney (University of Chicago): I'm not going to speak really for or against the motion, but I just think there are some things that we need to consider. It seems to me in Division III that over the years we really have believed in institutional autonomy, integrity, trust of our opponents. I just see that going away more and more and more all the time, and I really get concerned that all of our legislation is passed because we don't want the other person to get ahead of us. They are going to do something that we can't do. I had a part-time coach, in response to the one point, come to me and ask if I would vote for No. 135, a part-time coach, not a full-time coach, because he wanted the opportunity in the off-season when he happened to be on campus and a student asked him to show him how to do something with a foil that he would be able to do it. In response to the multisport athlete, we have a number of multisport athletes. The bad part is that they are deprived. For example, let's use a volleyball/softball player. The softball coach had a tryout in the fall. The athlete was playing volleyball. She didn't get the two weeks help that the rest

of the softball players had. She is free in January-February and wants to ask the softball coach a few questions. She can't do that because that would infringe on the softball season. So I think there is more than just worrying about part-time coaches and multisports coaches. Let's have some faith in our own people that they will do the right thing and that we are not worrying about a competitive edge all the time. Let's believe in integrity.

Royce N. Flippin Jr. (Massachusetts Institute of Technology): I'm sure we are hungry for the question, but I just wanted to bring up one more point. I'm not trying to put Bob Peck on the spot, but I think this deals with the interpretation of this particular legislation. When Bob and I were talking about this back and forth at the ECAC meeting yesterday, I believe—Bob, correct me—Bob said it was his thought that probably this legislation wouldn't stop lunch-time hitting between a coach and a tennis player, anyway. I think that's correct, Bob. I think that others have said the same thing to me. Whether or not we pass No. 135, which is a principle, we still are going to be able to have that individual hitting. At MIT, we read the rule that we can have no contact, whatsoever, no matter how much the individual wants it, the student wants it, even in terms of getting the tennis courts. I can't believe we want that to be the case. I happen to agree with Bob Peck, that lunch-time hitting is okay. As Bob suggested, and I'm for it, I think maybe Bob is for it, too, but frankly, I can't imagine we don't want that.

Robert R. Peck (Williams College): I'm sure everybody is dying to hear what my personal comments were to Royce earlier. I would like to assure this body that if this rule, this provision, is voted down, that there will be no Williams College coaches hitting with anybody out of the 21 weeks, or a football coach down at the field on Monday, Wednesday and Friday with the quarterbacks and Tuesday and Thursday with the wide receivers. We have a pretty good coach that can throw the ball pretty well, so we don't really need those quarterbacks. I would like to reassure everybody. When the rule was kind of fuzzy, I have had coaches come to me and say, "Bob, I'm not quite sure what to do about it, but we have this soccer group where a lot of different people play soccer, both men and women. Am I allowed to go down and play with them? Our coaches, some of them are simply good players. I said to him, "Are you trying to hold an outside coaching session or are you going to work out with a bunch of kids, some of whom play on our teams and some of them who do not?" He said, "No, I really want to work out." I said, "Well, that's in the spirit of the rule, and I don't see that that's a problem." But, obviously, if I have to give up that interpretation, I very willingly will give it up. So I would like to assure everybody that there will be no Williams College coaches hitting out of the 21 weeks or throwing a ball or doing anything of that at this point. I would urge defeat of this proposal, again.

[Proposal No. 135 (Page A-117) was defeated by Division III.]
[The Division III business session was recessed at 11:55 a.m.]

Tuesday Afternoon, January 10, 1989

The meeting was called to order at 1:15 p.m., with Mr. Van Wie presiding.

Mr. Van Wie (College of Wooster): The Division III business session is now in order.

PROPOSED AMENDMENTS

Foreign Tours

Nathan N. Salant (Middle Atlantic States Collegiate Athletic Conference): Mr. Chair, I am the commissioner of the Middle Atlantic States Collegiate Athletic Conference; and representing the 26 schools of the conference, I hereby move the adoption of Proposal No. 136.

[The motion was seconded.]

Ladies and gentlemen, the basic purpose of this legislation is to reduce the number of years required between foreign trips by member institutions in Division III. We believe that this is consistent with the philosophy of Division III, which emphasizes academics, cultural exchanges, et cetera, above and beyond athletics. I would say certainly that the opportunity to travel to other countries, to experience other lifestyles, to learn about other people, is consistent with that philosophy. The question might be asked, why reduce the number of years between the trips? We see two key reasons for this. The first one involves student-athletes whose institutions make foreign trips during the summer prior to their enrollment as freshmen. In that situation, for example, if an institution traveled out of the country in August of 1989, for any incoming freshman who is ineligible to make that trip, the next time that that student-athlete would be eligible would be approximately three months after his or her graduation. We feel that that's basically unfair and seek to reduce the number of years from four to three. The second type of problem that could occur would be someone who decides not to play as a freshman or someone who is on a junior varsity team and then the coach decides that that particular individual is not ready at the level of expertise to make that trip during the summer between his or her freshman year and sophomore season; there would not be another opportunity. Again, by reducing the number of years, it opens up that opportunity for those people. Now, we believe this is consistent with Division III philosophy and hope that the proposal will be acceptable.

[Proposal No. 136 (Page A-118) was approved by Division III.]

[Proposal No. 137 (Page A-118) was withdrawn.]

Individual Contest Limitations—Division III Basketball

J. Phillip Roach (Marietta College): I am president of the Ohio Athletic Conference on whose behalf I move the adoption of Proposal No. 138.

[The motion was seconded.]

The intent of this amendment is to count basketball by halves instead of by games. Most of our membership knows that at the

secondary school level this is the way it is done across the country, almost exclusively. If we look at our philosophy in the Manual, Statement No. 1 and supported again by Statement No. 5, this would allow the student-athlete to be in a developmental mode through the junior varsity program and, perhaps, play a minute or two in a varsity game and still only consider it one contest. We feel that it's not a burden in terms of the athlete's time; because in the sport of basketball, JV games or subvarsity games are played on the same day at the same site, usually, as a preliminary game. It is not another expense to the athletics department, of course, because of the same reason. So we think that it is prudent that we allow our intercollegiate basketball programs to promote more development of our student-athletes by allowing us to count the halves instead of the full game.

Rocco J. Carzo (Tufts University): I rise to oppose this on the basis of the objections voiced by the Division III Steering Committee. One, it creates an unreasonable number of competitive opportunities. Two, like Proposition No. 135, it will be extremely difficult to monitor. Three, there is a very strong concern about the exploitation of athletes by overzealous coaches. Therefore, we oppose this legislation.

[Proposal No. 138 (Page A-117) was defeated by Division III, 71-127.]

Postseason Tournament Exemption—Division III Football

William M. Moore (State University of New York, Albany): Mr. Chair, we respect the decision of the steering committee to withdraw Proposal 139, but request that it be considered and I move the adoption of this proposal.

[The motion was seconded.]

The basic intent of Proposal 139 is to clarify that the opportunity for a conference-sponsored postseason tournament in football is available for Division III member colleges, to limit such participation to a maximum of two games per member and to allow the member to exempt those games from counting against the current 10-game limit in Division III football. This will provide the membership the same conference-sponsored postseason opportunities for football teams as currently are provided for teams in all other sports. The legislation would allow a conference to select one or more of its football teams to participate in such a tournament or to invite a deserving team outside its conference to compete against one of its own. The selection of teams, however, could not be made until after the end of the regular-playing season. Adoption of this proposal would, therefore, make it possible for an additional number of football teams to enjoy a postseason experience having not been chosen for the NCAA championship.

John M. Schael [Washington University (Missouri)]: So, in essence, we have legislation in Division III that provides us the opportunity to have 10 regular-season games and one scrimmage. When you talk about a conference-sponsored tournament, most of us look at a conference as being the members that we play against

during the course of the in-season competition. For example, within the UAAA, I would look at that as being only our conference. Can someone interpret what is meant by "conference-sponsored tournament?" Would this just be limited to the seven or eight members that are part of one conference?

Mr. Moore: We in the ECAC have a far flung membership, some 43 football-playing schools. We do not have the options during the course of the year to play more than a select number of schools. So we are suggesting here, we have had the opportunity in the past, to have a postseason opportunity whereby teams within the widespread ECAC might have a regional experience against other teams.

Mr. Schael: Would this, then, provide the same opportunity for every other playing conference within the country at the Division III level? Can I select four conferences from the Midwest, or I might even want to select one from the West and one from the East, one from the South and one from the North. Can we then get together and play two additional football games and would this extend into basketball and the other sports at a conference level?

Charles J. Gordon (Rhodes College): I would urge defeat. We already have 10 opportunities. We have an opportunity for postseason play in the championships. This, to me, is excessive. It would provide too many conferences with extra opportunities; and we are concerned about class time, which has been voiced before. I would urge your defeat of this proposal.

Robert C. Deming (Ithaca College): The intention of this, obviously, is to continue an ECAC-sponsored football tournament that was started in 1983. In the ECAC, as an example, I am the chair of the ECAC Division III football committee. I'm also on the NCAA Division III football committee. I know in the ECAC that we have 89 institutions competing for the four spots in the NCAA tournament. Out of our 89 schools, we had 24 schools that had two or fewer losses last year; and basically, what we are looking at is an opportunity to expand so that those teams might have a postseason opportunity. If the question is a one- or a two-game playoff, that's a separate question. What we are looking for is the permissive opportunity, as an ECAC-sponsored conference play-off, to proceed. We have done it since 1983. It has been very satisfactory. We found that there was a little bind in it. We tried to go through this process and deal with it at the NCAA level. Right now, we have an interpretation that we are okay. We brought this to the Convention in order for us to get that cleared on the books. We do have a little bit of a unique situation in that there are a lot more schools in our region than there are in the other regions of the country, and for that reason we would ask your support.

John Schael [Washington University (Missouri)]: This is the last comment I will make on it. We can create a lot more participating institutions at the Division III level by opening it up for all conferences that might want to participate in a postseason tournament. Call it a conference tournament and extend the season by two games in football. I'm sure that we could find many conferences that would do

that.

William A. Marshall (Franklin and Marshall College): I heard the word "excessive" used before by one of the speakers. His team participated in the Division III NCAA tournament this year, and he didn't seem to think that was excessive. Whether you compete in the NCAA tournament or a conference-sponsored tournament, I think they can be considered the same in terms of the number of games and the level of competition that goes on.

Rocco J. Carzo (Tufts University): I think there is an advantage here, also, for those schools who choose not to go to the NCAA tournament. This is the regional tournament that some schools would declare for, but not declare for national tournaments.

Capt. James E. Foels (U.S. Coast Guard Academy): About every 25 years, the Coast Guard has a pretty good football season. In 1963, we went to the Tangerine Bowl. Right on schedule, in 1988 we had a good year. Unfortunately, or fortunately, as the case may be, there were a lot of schools in the eastern region of the NCAA that had good seasons. Four of those were selected over the Coast Guard Academy. I think we were very, very, very fortunate to have been selected to participate in the ECAC championship, which has been a quality championship over the last several years. We had a North and a South championship. It would have been extremely desirable to go on and participate in an overall ECAC championship. We play nine games during the season. We limit our schedule. However, we believe that we should allow the athletes the opportunity, if the institution desires, to have a chance to participate in postseason competition. It is incredible what it has done for the academy and our spirit throughout the Coast Guard. The 39,000 members of the Coast Guard look at us at this institution and what a fine year we had in football. I would urge the support of the membership to adopt this legislation.

Mary Jean Mulvaney (University of Chicago): I think there is a bit of a question here that I have. If the ECAC has championships in all of these various sports, I do not understand. I question that if they are going to have championships, then it's more than just an umbrella conference. I really question whether this group of institutions should be able to have two extra games over and above, or even one extra game, over and above what is expected of the rest of us.

[Proposal No. 139 (Page A-119) was postponed until the general business session.]

[Proposal No. 140 (Page A-120) was postponed until the general business session.]

Contest Limitations—Division III Softball

Judith M. Sweet (University of California, San Diego): On behalf of the Division III Steering Committee, I move the adoption of Proposal No. 141.

[The motion was seconded.]

In the sport of softball, it's common to hold single- or double-

elimination tournaments where the number of games in which teams are involved is not predetermined but is dependent upon the continued success of the teams in the tournament. This format makes it impossible for a team to project the actual number of contests within the 40-game maximum in the sport of softball. When the annual schedule is determined, this becomes a complication. This has forced teams to schedule as if they win all games in the tournament or risk having to cancel contests if they did not accurately project their success. Divisions I and II have legislation that allows each date of a tournament in softball to count as one contest on 10 occasions for purposes of Bylaw 3, Contest Limitations. This proposal for the Division III membership would allow each date of a softball tournament in Division III to be counted as one contest, no matter how many contests are played on that date, provided not more than two tournaments are counted in this matter during an academic year. The members of the Division III Steering Committee support this proposal and I urge its adoption.

[Proposal No. 141 (Page A-120) was approved by Division III.]

Playing Season—Division III Track

Mary R. Barrett (University of Massachusetts, Boston): I move the adoption of Proposal No. 142.

[The motion was seconded.]

Currently in Division III, all schools have a 21-week playing season. This proposal will allow the school that is in indoor and outdoor track to have a combined playing season of 26 weeks. The Division III Steering Committee believes that a 26-week playing season is not excessive when it is for two sports combined. On behalf of the Division III Steering Committee, I urge your support of this proposal.

F. Paul Bogan (Westfield State College): I would like some clarification. If you are combining indoor and outdoor track, does that mean on the application form that I still count it as two separate sports or one sport? That's my first question? We treat them as two separate sports and the understanding was each had 21 weeks. You are saying now that you are combining it into one sport for 26 weeks. Now, on your information form, when you certify the number of sports, is this considered a separate sport or are there two different sports?

Mr. Van Wie: Two different sports, Paul. The staff has ruled that it is two different sports.

Mr. Bogan: If I have spring track for women, you are telling me now that they have a 26-week period. I don't have indoor track for women, do I have 21 weeks or do I have 26 weeks?

John M. Schael (Washington University (Missouri)): If you have indoor track and indoor track only, you would have 21 weeks. If you have outdoor track and only outdoor track, you would have 21 weeks. If you have both, if you have an indoor and outdoor track program, say, for men and/or an indoor and outdoor track program for women,

you would have a combined 26 weeks. You want to keep it within the academic framework of the institution and that would allow you to have all of your participations and competitions within that period of time.

Walter J. Johnson (North Central College): It's my understanding that track is the only sport that has two national championships in the NCAA. If that is the case, we need to allow opportunity for preparation for both national championships. We are not requesting an additional 21 weeks, we are only requesting five more weeks that will allow for that additional preparation for the extra championship. It is, in fact, one sport; but it takes place in two separate seasons, indoor season and outdoor season. So, I would propose that we adopt this proposal.

Mark Peterson (Buena Vista College): For two years, I have observed the steering committee coming to us with what I would consider sane legislation on weeks of competition and also number of contests. I have great concern about this piece of legislation. First of all, it puts a great deal of strain on those of us who have limited facilities; and secondly, those same people that are jumping, running indoor are going to jump and run outdoor. And, 26 weeks seems to be an excessive amount of time to do that.

Everett J. Phillips (Fredonia State University College): One of the advantages that this 26-week season would give those of us in the colder climates is a training session for outdoor events that are not contested indoors. At the present time, New York state high schools do not compete in the javelin or the hammer throw; and we inherit a lot of high school students who have never seen or participated in those events. We normally have used the month of September and early October, before the snow flies, to teach those events to prospective track people. With the 21-week season we cannot do this and have our indoor and outdoor seasons. We encourage its passage, simply on the position of training future participants.

George L. James (Stockton State College): I would like to speak to the issue a little bit. For those of you who are a little bit leery about the number of weeks, there is a number-of-contest limitation imposed. All this legislation would do is provide an opportunity, a little bit of leeway given the area of the country that a school would be located in, to be able to seek out the specific number of competitions or adequate number of competitions to play in either indoor or outdoor.

[Proposal No. 142 (Page A-121) was approved by Division III.]

WAIVERS

[Note: The Division III business session heard a petition for waiver of Division III membership criteria from Menlo College. The petition was approved.]

[Note: A verbatim record of further discussions in Division III following adjournment of the business session is on file in the national office.]

[The Division III business session was adjourned at 2:30 p.m.]

Division I Business Session

Tuesday Afternoon, January 10, 1989

The Division I business session was called to order at 1 p.m., with Albert M. Witte, University of Arkansas, Fayetteville, presiding.

OPENING REMARKS

Mr. Witte: Will the delegates please take your seats. Before we get to the legislative proposals, we have a few matters to consider. Although this does not appear on the agenda, President Wil Bailey and members of the deregulation committee have asked for an opportunity to appear before us at this time to discuss or make comments about the proposed Manual revision.

Wilford S. Bailey (Auburn University): Some months ago, as we were making plans for considerations to revise the Manual, we asked the Council for the opportunity for a meeting with each of the three divisions for some explanation and to respond to any questions. At that time, we had not planned and developed the series of articles that you have seen in The NCAA News; and so some of what we had intended to do already has been accomplished, we think, in that series of articles. We think that it is not necessary for us to go into any explanation about the major changes or things of that kind.

There are one or two things, though, that we want to comment about for just a moment and then try to respond to any questions. The rationale for Proposal No. 70, the second of the two resolutions about the revised Manual, is the result of the recognition that in spite of our best efforts, given all the time that we had taken, the assiduous work of the staff—and the staff has done a tremendous job, Ted Tow and his staff and Steve Morgan, in the final review process—in spite of our best efforts, we knew it couldn't be perfect. We felt there had to be a safety valve so that once it was put into use there would be an opportunity for correction if it was found by the membership that some change in wording to try to make it easier to read and easier to understand had, in fact, changed the intent of the legislation. We diligently tried to avoid that, and we have had two questionable wordings brought to our attention. They will be considered and handled under the safety-valve resolution.

If any of you has identified such questionable areas, we would appreciate your bringing them to our attention. I think perhaps the best way to do that is to submit those in writing to the legislative services staff member manning the interpretations desk.

In the final development, just within the past few days in the development of the where-did-it-go list, we found there was one

citation that had not been inserted. It is not in the proposed Manual but it will be in the Manual that will come out hopefully in late March or early April. That will be mentioned tomorrow before consideration of the resolution to adopt. We want to be sure that everyone understands that.

There is one bit of information we think you will be interested in that was announced to the Council on Friday. Our committee recommended in October that now that the new Manual—assuming its adoption, which we hope will be effective tomorrow—is on the computer, it can be made available to the membership at institutions or conferences on computer disk; and it is planned that there will be six or seven disks, IBM compatible, that will cost you \$4 a disk. They will be available as soon as possible after the new Manual is published and distributed to the membership.

I think with those comments that I would like to say that we appreciate so very much the help that many of you have given in reviewing drafts. Many of you have helped in other ways. Your assistance and encouragement and support has been most helpful. The other members of the committee are here, and we are all here in an effort to respond as quickly and effectively as possible to any questions that you have. We have had specific assignments. For example, Clayton Chapman is the playing-season specialist with those numbers. I think you all know Clayton Chapman with the ECAC. Also David Price from the Pac-10 Conference, Prentice Gault of the Big Eight Conference and Donna Lopiano from the University of Texas at Austin. With those comments, we will try to respond to any questions that you may have. I would be less than honest if I didn't say that given the effort to communicate effectively with the membership, there was not a single request for review of any one of those. We view that with a great deal of satisfaction, and we appreciate the response you have made to the Manual.

RECONSIDERATION OF PROPOSED AMENDMENTS

Mr. Witte: I have been informed that there may be a desire to move for reconsideration of some of the legislation dealt with this morning.

Reconsideration of Maximum Awards—Divisions I-A, I-AA Football

David M. Guinn (Baylor University): Mr. Chair, this morning I voted in favor of No. 63-A, and I would now like to move that it be reconsidered.

[The motion was seconded.]

Several of my peers have pointed out that some schools do maintain a large number of walk-ons and that there is the possibility that this could in effect develop sort of a shallow team. As these youngsters develop and perhaps some of the 95 designated do not, the later group might be encouraged to leave and then use these to fill in. There are some other reservations that several others have and I will permit them to speak on them at this time.

Frank Windegger (Texas Christian University): This piece of legislation hurts the private institutions because of differences in cost

of education compared to the state institutions. My colleague, Jim Lessig, this morning stated that there is a safeguard with the cap of 95. In reality, it works just the opposite. Coaches will be allowed to correct their recruiting mistakes by running off (student-athletes). Squads will get bigger; and as that happens, costs will swell. You will have greater costs in your sport services and medical services, in your equipment room and tutoring, and so forth.

The most important point I would like to make is that this mitigates any scholarships reductions imposed by the NCAA Infractions Committee. If you have a walk-on on your squad that has been there two years, you immediately can put him on scholarship. As soon as he meets that criteria, those squads can be filled out to meet that 95 just as fast as they are eligible to do so. I urge defeat of this legislation.

D. Alan Williams (University of Virginia): I am chair of the Committee on Infractions. For reasons separate to some extent from those of Mr. Windegger but reemphasizing his concern about mitigation of penalty, the committee can live and adjust to any regulations that the Association passes. But it is our feeling that in this case, having rendered penalties, we are unable to go back and reconsider them. It is our feeling that for this year only, without regard to the merits of the legislation any other way, the three members of the committee who are present here today—one was strongly in favor, one was opposed and one was mildly opposed but intends to take advantage of it—would ask you to vote to reconsider this and to defeat this for this year only.

James W. Lessig (Mid-American Athletic Conference): In putting forth Proposal 63-A, I did it on behalf of the NCAA Council; and you will note in the program that it was on behalf of the Recruiting Committee, which had looked at this carefully. Since this morning, in talking to members of the Infractions Committee, they informed me that they felt the passage of this would impede their ability to move forward with some penalties that already have been levied. I don't believe the NCAA Council, the Recruiting Committee or anyone else wants to do anything that would interfere with the work of the Infractions Committee. I am happy, if that is the case, to see this brought back to a vote this year. I am happy to know, however, that you are not in disagreement with the merits. I think this should be brought back a year from now when the Infractions Committee can no longer be tied down by this, and they guarantee that they will not. I have no objection to what they are suggesting. I definitely would like to bring this back one year from now.

[Proposal No. 63-A (Page A-64) was defeated by Division I-A. First approved by Division I-A, 61-45; then defeated after motion to reconsider was approved.]

Reconsideration of Number of Contests—Division I-A

Rudy Davalos (University of Houston): Mr. Chair, having voted on the prevailing side, I move to reconsider Proposal Nos. 126 and 126-1.

[The motion was seconded.]

I am prepared to talk about No. 126 as amended. My concerns are right now that universities already have a method of playing in a foreign country by using one of the 11 games already on your schedule. If it is your desire to do that and can schedule another university to play, and want to sacrifice a home game and revenues, and whatever, you have that option available. I think that if you add a 12th game that the football coaches at our universities are going to demand that their athletics directors get into this, and everybody will have to try to get a 12th game in a foreign country to keep up with the Joneses.

If you allow the more prestigious schools to jump into it, I think there will be a recruiting advantage. I think it will create a situation where the athletics directors at our institutions will have to try to work very hard to get a trip in a foreign country, as I say, to keep up with the Joneses.

[Proposal Nos. 126 and 126-1 (Page A-112) were defeated by Division I-A. First approved, 67-41, they were defeated after a motion to reconsider was approved.]

PROPOSED AMENDMENTS

Partial Qualifier

Harvey W. Schiller (Southeastern Conference): On behalf of the Southeastern Conference, I move the adoption of Proposal No. 42.

[The motion was seconded.]

This proposal will eliminate athletically related financial aid for those who do not qualify under the guidelines of Bylaw 5-1-(j). It does not preclude nonqualifiers nor does it preclude other allowable financial aid. It does apply a standard for all of our student-athletes. This is an opportunity to send a message to our secondary schools that adequate preparation for prospective student-athletes is at least as important as athletics development. Why allow the grade-point average outside the core curriculum? Why have a standard if you don't apply that standard? Many high school coaches and others now are advising high school student-athletes to avoid a core curriculum and standardized tests. They are now viewed by many as nothing other than a redshirted class. If we wait and see if our argument is right, then we should have studied Proposition 48 further before adopting that legislation years ago. I urge approval of this proposal as a reaffirmation of our minimum academic standards.

William H. Powell (University of Georgia): We want to be certain that the membership understands the true intent of this proposal, and the intent is to eliminate financial aid to any student-athlete who is not a qualifier under 5-1-(j). At present, the receipt of financial aid is the only separation between the nonqualifier and the partial qualifier. When Proposition 48 was first adopted, many understood 5-1-(j) to apply to the student-athlete who failed to achieve either the core-curriculum requirements or the standardized tests. In practice, the partial qualifier simply became the old 2,000-grade

qualifier, which in the minds of many was not the true goal of Proposition 48. Adoption of 42 would remove this aspect of Bylaw 5-1-(j). We believe this to be movement toward the original intent of Proposition 48, which we continue to believe to be sound academic policy that ultimately will benefit the entire population of the student-athletes and we urge its adoption.

Michael Swartz (Kent State University): In the same vein that I spoke to on No. 41, the Division I members of the Presidents Commission have asked me to represent them and ask this body to oppose this, pending a longer-range experience in view of Bylaw 5-1-(j).

Joseph S. Boland III (Auburn University): Mr. Chair, I would like to speak in support of Proposal No. 42. If it is passed, it will result in only two classifications: the full qualifier, who may receive financial aid and enter into practice and competition, and the nonqualifier, who may not receive financial aid and is not eligible to practice or compete. Propositions 48 and 56, the so-called financial aid eligibility and satisfactory-progress proposals, were passed by previous Conventions to insure that only academically qualified student-athletes are eligible for financial aid and that they make satisfactory progress toward the specific degree they are after.

Proposition 42, in this Convention, moves us a step closer to obtaining that goal and sends a clear message to the junior high school and high school students who desire to compete at the intercollegiate level that they must prepare themselves academically in high school in order to be eligible for competition. I think it is fair to state that almost all NCAA institutions have attempted to hold the number of qualifiers granted financial aid to a minimum. Indeed, some institutions have taken the unilateral position that they will not grant financial aid for partial qualifiers. The Southeastern Conference at its spring meeting last year voted to phase out the awarding of financial aid for all partial qualifiers by 1993. Proposition 42, if passed, will remove the pressure on all of our institutions to grant financial aid to partial qualifiers and in the long run should increase our retention rate and graduation rate. I urge you to vote for Proposition 42.

Douglas S. Hobbs (University of California, Los Angeles): I am chair of the Academic Requirements Committee. That committee took no position on the merits of either 42 or 43. However, noting that only three classes have been admitted under Proposition 48, the committee firmly believes that it is too early to tinker with 48 and would strongly urge that the Convention keep hands off at least until we have experienced four, preferably five years, of admitting classes.

L. Douglas Johnson [University of Miami (Florida)]: Speaking on behalf of Proposition 42, Bylaw 5-1-(j) was passed in an effort to encourage and require that every prospective student-athlete be prepared adequately for the rigorous collegiate program. By establishing the partial-qualifier status, we have changed our message by saying in essence that you are a good enough athlete and we will give

you initial scholarship regardless of the fact that you did not meet the minimal-academic requirements. The partial-qualifying status is inconsistent with the original goals of Bylaw 5-1-(j) and our mission to increase academic standards at all educational levels. By passing Proposition 42, we will be sending the appropriate message to all high school prospects who must prepare themselves that athletics performance is not a substitute for academic performance. In the long run, passage of this proposal befits athletes as well as colleges and universities to develop student-athletes to their potentials.

Thomas E. Yeager (Colonial Athletic Association): Following the lengthy and heated debate in San Diego in 1983 when Bylaw 5-1-(j) was adopted, Proposition 49-B establishing the partial qualifier was adopted with virtually no debate. It was adopted as the transitional rule to bridge the gap from the 2,000 rule to the new standards proposed by 48. As you all know, following substantial research in 1986, we adopted a sliding scale to again ease the grade-point average and test-score requirements in the initial years of implementation of Proposition 48. That transition has run its course; so now to the partial qualifier.

For those that say that 5-1-(j) has not had a chance to be tested yet, we have tinkered with it every year. We added one year where we initially started the partial qualifier and denied financial aid and didn't use the year of eligibility, and we came back later and put a year of penalty on. We had the sliding scale. I think this is the final tinkering of Bylaw 5-1-(j), to remove the partial qualifier and finally enact what was voted upon back in 1983.

Marshall M. Criser (University of Florida): I support adoption of Proposal 42 and endorse the comments made previously that as long as the partial-qualifier rule is presently, as stated, in place, there is an ambiguous standard for high school students to try to understand. I want to point out to you that this rule has now been adopted by the State University System of Florida and applies to all state universities in that state in substantially the form of the Southeastern Conference rule. We urge the Convention to adopt Proposal No. 42.

Donald W. Zacharias (Mississippi State University): I am concerned that there was a statement regarding the Presidents Commission, but there was no indication as to what the vote was in the Presidents Commission. May we ask if it was unanimous from the Presidents Commission? The impression was given by the speaker that all presidents supported the action that was taken by the Commission.

Michael Swartz (Kent State University): Mr. Chair, to the best of my knowledge, there was no dissent from that position.

Mr. Zacharias: Mr. Chair, was there a vote?

Mr. Witte: The answer seems to be no.

Mr. Zacharias: Thank you, sir. I speak in opposition to the action taken by the Presidents Commission and in support of Proposition 42.

[Proposal No. 42 (Page A-28) was defeated by Division I, 151-159,

four abstentions; roll-call vote. See Page A-29 for subsequent voting action.]

Eligibility—Partial Qualifier and Nonqualifier

Stanford Cazier (Utah State University): On behalf of the Midwestern Athletic Conference, I move adoption of Proposal No. 43. [The motion was seconded.]

Proposal No. 43 is in line with the original intent and spirit of Proposition 48 to provide the opportunity for the university-prepared student-athletes to dramatize academically during their freshman year prior to exposing them to the additional rigors of practice and competition in the intercollegiate setting. Subsequent amendments to the original Proposition 48 have added punitive measures that ultimately have taken away some incentives for the student-athlete to achieve at a high level academically and to complete the baccalaureate degree.

Proposal No. 43 provides new incentives for the serious student to earn a degree by returning in the fourth year of competition to the fifth-year clock. In order for the student-athletes to qualify for this highly motivating reward and return to the normalcy that their teammates enjoy, a partial or nonqualifier must complete a minimum of 96 semester hours or 144 core units applicable for a specific baccalaureate program at the certifying institution by the beginning of their fifth year following the initial full-time enrollment. Importantly, the granting of this permission shall be overseen and administered by the member conferences. This has been discussed briefly this morning; and if I can just comment about some of the comments this morning, I don't think it sends the wrong message to the high schools. Nonqualifiers and partial qualifiers still will have an obligation to meet the academic qualifications before they can practice and compete in athletics. It is an opportunity for us also to remove a stigma; because some of those, for whatever reason, disadvantaged on entry into college may be very successful during their four years of collegiate work. It is conceivable that they will graduate in four years summa cum laude, but they carry with them the stigma that they were not allowed to participate in four years of intercollegiate athletics.

Currently, the sentiment is to oppose further participation and further academics. This is a high incentive to graduate; because if you adjust the minimum of 36 quarter hours to 144, that almost will be tantamount to graduation. Therefore, a student could move into a variety of markets, could swim in the mainstream, either athletically or academically. And, there is not in this the concept of professional student; there is a five-year limit.

Those of you who bought yesterday's Newsweek read an article in there that said "Jocks With Books." With the exception of a reference to the Ivy League, Duke and Miami, it is somewhat a satirical article and not exactly favorable to the NCAA. The reference in this, and I will give two quick quotes and then I will be through, is that it is, of

course, heresy to suggest, but just suppose that big-time college sports ran on the premise that studying and athletics were not mutually exclusivities. I imagine a world in which these exalted stars of collegiate teams live by the same rules as their classmates and graduate with a degree. Proposal 43 allows for that. Last week, the top-ranked teams in both football and basketball, Notre Dame and Duke respectively, recommended a period to acquaint athlete-scholars.

Many colleges, and the implication is here, within the NCAA give lip service to the idea that you have basketball players and football players that can be educated. Proposal 43 provides that opportunity.

Keith Polakoff (California State University, Long Beach): On behalf of the members of the Big West Conference, I move the adoption of Proposal No. 43—1.

[The motion was seconded.]

This is simply a housekeeping motion. The members of the NCAA staff clarified a better way to achieve the intent of the original language of Proposal 43, which is that this opportunity to gain a lost year of eligibility occur only once and that at the beginning of the fifth year on the fifth-year plot. The NCAA staff has suggested that the use of the phrase "academic year" rather than "calendar year" better achieves that purpose. This amendment to amendment is proposed for that purpose.

[Proposal No. 43—1 (Page A-30) was approved by Division I.]

[NOTE: Proposal No. 43, as amended by No. 43—1, was discussed after the delegates considered No. 44 but is included here for convenience.]

Robert Bradley (National Association of Academic Advisors for Athletics): Our executive board endorsed Proposal No. 43. Having defeated Proposal No. 42, coaches will continue to recruit partial qualifiers. They are not as unattractive as many of us had hoped. We, as academic counselors, currently are dealing with these young people. The coaches will bring them into the colleges knowing that they have little chance of graduating in four years. This proposal (No. 43) is not perfect, but it is a vote for the student-athletes that your coaches brought and will continue to bring in. It may provide motivation toward graduation. As I said, this is not perfect but neither is the system that marries the pressure and demands of big-time athletics with the pressures and demands of college classes.

Stanley M. Morrison (University of California, Santa Barbara): As a body, the NCAA has said that a student-athlete's education is so important and so primary to our collective mission that we are going to deny practice and play the first year to assure academic progress. If you progress and demonstrate a minimum of academic success at the intercollegiate level, you get to play for three years. We have implied that academic progress will not be hindered by athletics participation in years two, three and four. Is it not logical that we need to validate the original action by rewarding the student-athlete who has maintained the unit progress and good academic standards with the university and matriculated in a legitimate major?

Coaches, counselors and tutors at our institutions are more likely to receive the award of completion rather than the limbo that exists when an athlete at the end of four years has neither a degree nor a team to play for. To presume that all would qualify for participation in year five is as naive as thinking that a message has been sent to high schools that athletes now have a loophole to use. The grade-point averages achieved in the high schools is so diverse that it is impossible to agree that the blanket standard is valid. Surely, a four-year effort of academic success at the university level is far more valid as a measure of progress than the former. As in the beginning, if at the end of four years the student-athlete doesn't have the appropriate GPA units passed in a legitimate major, he will not compete any longer for his institution.

However, if Prop 48 works, if Prop 48 is valid, if Prop 48 produces the hoped-for results anticipated by this Association, then, and only then, will the student-athlete be given the opportunity to compete at his physical, emotional and intellectual best and finish the work and receive a degree. I urge your support of Proposal 43.

Roy Kramer (Vanderbilt University): In all due respect to the previous speaker, we have not seen a piece of legislation that more significantly destroys the intent and the purpose of Proposal 48 and 5-1-(j). We have argued continually that we shouldn't tamper with it, and now, we are taking that major step. We are opening a Pandora's box not only for the partial qualifier, but more significantly even for the nonqualifier. We have taken a step backwards if we pass this type of legislation; because we not only are going to look at that type of thing, we are going to encourage our coaches to do what they already are doing, whether you are aware of it or not. I will tell you it is being done in the trenches, encouraging the athlete not to take the test, to be careful of the core curriculum and get in and we will take care of you.

The very statement that was made previously that these people will not have a chance to graduate will be completely glossed over by the coach. He will be encouraged to bring that individual in despite the fact he has no chance to graduate. It is a bad piece of legislation, and we ought to vote it down unanimously.

John W. Sawyer (Wake Forest University): This proposal is presented in a very noble manner; but if we strip away the nobility for just a moment, 96 hours in four years is the absolute minimum that an athlete must make to maintain eligibility. So, all this proposal is doing is saying that every athlete, qualifier or nonqualifier, will have four years of eligibility if they can meet minimum standards.

Charles Whitcomb (San Jose State University): Mr. Chair, in commenting on some of the things that have been expressed here, I again want to speak in behalf of Proposition 43. Some have come out and talked about the message we send down to our high school students, but Proposal 43 does not lessen the academic standards we already have in place with Bylaw 5-1-(j). We still state that the partial and nonqualifier can have no association with the team, no competi-

tion or outside team. I don't think any student whatsoever is going to think that entry into college athletics is going to be any less typical than it was in high school. Bylaw 5-1-(j), I think, says we have taken an opportunity to reward especially these young men and young women who are entering into our institutions and have put the care out there for them to achieve their academic success.

Not often in this Association, not often in intercollegiate athletics, has there been a stand taken to encourage young men and young women to achieve a level of satisfaction, a level of graduation standards by offering some type of opportunities for them. I think this piece of legislation does that. It encourages those young men and women who have matriculated successfully at their institutions to remain to graduate. It gives back to them the very thing that we have taken away.

We have said that in order for them to be better prepared, in order to make it through our institutions, they can not participate during that first academic year. With the passage of 43, we now have said that we are hoping that you have done successfully everything we have asked you to do and you now have an opportunity to remain in our institution and graduate. I really strongly believe that this is the one proactive measure that we can do as an institution and Association to encourage young men and women to move towards graduation and remain at their institution.

Jerry L. Kingston (Arizona State University): I rise in opposition to Proposition No. 43. I believe that indeed it is a proposition that speaks to incentives. The previous speaker is correct when he indicates that student-athletes who are enrolled in the Division I schools will, in fact, have a greater incentive to graduate. I also believe that this same proposition creates the incentive for there to be more of them. There will be more of them because I believe that the coaches will be encouraged to recruit these individuals with the promise that, in fact, they will be able to get a degree. I think this further erodes the spirit of Proposition 48 in that it allows high school students to believe that there is still hope, there is some opportunity that they can bypass those requirements and still be able to compete as they would have if they had been qualifiers. So, I strongly oppose this legislation.

Edward E. Bozik (University of Pittsburgh): I am speaking in support of this proposal. When we passed Proposition 48, whether we intended or not, it was clearly discriminatory. I would urge that we do not compound our error by discriminating further in defeating this legislation. My colleague, Mr. Kramer, spoke this morning eloquently, if not persuasively, on the retention of student-athletes. I am surprised, therefore, that he would speak against this proposal. We are talking about retention. I believe we are talking about, ladies and gentlemen, next year. That is when the first group of Prop 48 students will become ineligible by our standards. I would expect next year that we are going to be challenged, if not legally, certainly morally. I would urge that you look at this legislation, not as a matter of official

eligibility, not as a matter of diluting Proposition 48 but as a matter of equity and fair treatment of student-athletes who have worked and will have worked to achieve the standards that are permitted in this legislation.

Michael T. Bowers (University of California, Santa Barbara): I would like to speak in favor of this legislation. I was moved, as many of us were, by what Dick Schultz said at the opening of the Convention on Sunday. His closing line particularly was moving. In those closing lines, he said that the NCAA is not just about football. The NCAA is not just about basketball. The NCAA is about education.

I am concerned for the education of our students. I am as concerned for the education of those who enter as so-called Prop 48 students as I am with any other students. I think we need to do as much as we can to motivate those students to be successful in the academic environment. It is clear coming in as a Prop 48 student that there is a possibility they might be less qualified initially than other students. Therefore, they need not only the stick we have beat on them with, but they need to carry it. They need motivation to study all the way through their collegiate career, to be successful, to graduate and end up as meaningful members of our society. I think that is what the collegiate experience is all about. Certainly that is what it is about for student-athletes.

I am a professor of chemistry; and as such at the University of California, Santa Barbara, I deal with many graduate students. One of the things that I find that I deal with them about is to get past the notion of doing chemistry for studying problems to being a chemist. It is a transition that is crucial for them in their professional lives. I am interested in Proposition 48 students. They are going through the transition of being in school or attending, or trying to go to class or figuring out things to becoming students. More than that, they are becoming engineers, businessmen, business majors, sociologists, whatever, to become something fully. I think this is an opportunity for them to do that. I think it is a responsibility for us in the Association to promote that in every way possible. I think Prop 43 does that. I urge your support.

Margaret Gatz (University of Southern California): I am inspired to speak against this proposal, and I have two points I want to make. The first is that this is a particularly insidious proposal, which would circumvent Bylaw 5-1-(j). The idea behind Bylaw 5-1-(j) is to encourage preparation before college. This proposal does not do that. My second point is a comment on the idea of incentive. I find the idea of an incentive particularly attractive, but this incentive is not nearly enough. If the aim is to guarantee that people will graduate, then I would urge that we imagine another proposal such as, say, before beginning the fourth year of competition you are within 12 units of the senior year. I would anticipate a large number of students who play the fourth year as provided by the university with their 96 units.

Frederick S. Humphries (Florida A&M University): I am in favor of this proposition, but not as much in favor as if we had passed

the previous proposition, which would deny aid to the partial qualifier during the first year of college. There are two very nice things about the nonqualifier in this proposition. First of all, I don't think that it is delving into Proposition 48, because the nonqualifier has to pay his way the first year of college. In so doing, that nonqualifier indicates his or her interest in attending an institution of higher education and a desire for a college education. If he or she overcomes that first year and becomes a student in a baccalaureate degree program—and this proposal or proposition allows that to occur—then we have done something very good by athletics aid for this particular student. We are allowing this person to achieve, or at least have a great opportunity of achieving, a baccalaureate degree.

I believe the first year of nonsupport is adequate punishment for not paying attention in high school. I am not solely in favor of Prop 48, because we have a lot of fortunate qualifiers, which means that a student gets the five years. So, I rise to support it partially and would urge this group to go back and consider the proposition that dealt with the partial qualifiers. Then this proposal would be an excellent way of achieving Proposition 48 and at the same time conveying the message of providing opportunity in Proposal 48, an opportunity to get a baccalaureate degree.

James W. Garvey (Hofstra University): While the proponents of Proposition 43 legitimately would hope to entice and encourage, I think that this really has shown us that you may find student-athletes spending far more time in weight rooms across America than they ever will in laboratories or libraries. Therefore, I cannot support this legislation.

[Proposal No. 43 (Page A-29), as amended by No. 43—1, was defeated by Division I, 135-179, two abstentions; roll-call vote.]

Transfer—Junior College Nonqualifier

John J. Coyle (Pennsylvania State University): I would like to move for the adoption of Proposal No. 44.

[The motion was seconded.]

The underlying rationale for Proposal No. 44 is to help assure graduation of junior college transfers who are nonqualifiers. As you know, these individuals need only to complete two years and 48 credits prior to transfer in order to be eligible to participate. I am certain that most of you are aware of the growing number of such student-athletes being recruited and immediately put into the pressure of big-time college athletics. Even if these individuals successfully keep in step with the NCAA's satisfactory-progress rule after they transfer, they will have completed only 96 credits at the end of four years, two years in the junior college and two years in the four-year school. However, they usually will be at least one or two years away from completing their degree requirements with no eligibility remaining. Given these circumstances, it does not take much imagination to conclude that there is a high probability that these students will leave school without graduating.

This proposal will give the junior college transfer students who are nonqualifiers a year to adjust to the new school where academics probably are more vigorous than those they previously experienced and also perhaps more importantly help insure that they use up their eligibility closer to the time when they are completing their degree requirements. I urge you to pass this proposal.

Peter Simis (California State University, Fresno): I would like to speak against the proposal. This is very similar to college students that play the sport of football in junior college one semester and then go to another one the next year. It has in it violation of the academic-intent principle. The rule requires that the person graduate from the junior college. The person who goes through this, I think, should not be penalized for that.

John E. Nowak (University of Illinois, Champaign): This does not do what the last speaker said. If you will note, what it says is that in addition to the current requirements, if the transfer student was a nonqualifier, the student is not eligible for one year. So, in fact, what was intended was to add a requirement; and that is why, and surprisingly, it starts out with the words "in addition." Thus, what we have here is a situation where the junior college transfer is not disadvantaged in the same sense that most Division I transfers have to sit out a year. The student is required only to take an academic redshirt year. The student is allowed to receive aid and to practice, and there is really what seems to many of us no argument against the proposal except by those who would like to use the student to compete right away, even though there is little likelihood that if that is done that the student will stay for a sufficient time for graduation.

Gary Ness (University of New Mexico): Our university has made a strong attempt to articulate transfer from two-year institutions to our four-year institution. This works against the spirit of that. I also feel that since there are regulations in place for transfers, that imposing this as a penalty. It is punitive.

[Proposal No. 44 (Page A-31) was defeated by Division I, 103-208, four abstentions; roll-call vote..]

Initial Eligibility—Standardized Testing Deadline

Charlotte West (Southern Illinois University, Carbondale): On behalf of the NCAA Council, I move the adoption of Proposal No. 49-A.

[The motion was seconded.]

This proposal resulted from the concerns expressed regarding the application of Bylaw 5-1-(j) and the July 1 testing deadline to those prospective student-athletes who either graduated early or those who were from a foreign country and graduated from secondary schools that have the nontraditional academic calendar. For example, under the current legislation, the prospect who graduates early, say, in December of his or her senior year, and who enrolls in a member institution in January, would not be able to utilize the support from a test taken in November of that year even though the prospect is still

in high school at the time the test was taken. The prospect and graduate from a high school with a nontraditional academic calendar, a foreign student, is faced with the same problem. Proposal No. 49-A will solve this by allowing the prospect to utilize scores from an SAT or ACT test that is taken by the end of his or her final term of secondary education even if that term ended in midyear. I urge adoption of this proposal.

[Proposal No. 49-A (Page A-50) was approved by Division I]

Satisfactory Progress

Robert A. Stein (University of Minnesota, Twin Cities): On behalf of the Big Ten Conference, I move the adoption of Proposal No. 53.

[The motion was seconded.]

Delegates to Division I, I urge your support of Proposal 53. By this time, most of you know this proposal very well. It is the academic-progress rule advanced by the Big Ten Conference in several prior Conventions. Last year, you passed it narrowly in a roll-call vote; and then it was rescinded again narrowly on a roll-call vote. It was adopted in Division II last year, and I urge you to pass it this year in Division I and to keep it passed. Proposal No. 53 will establish an objective, qualitative satisfactory-progress rule. As you see, it requires a 1.600 minimum grade-point average after the first season of competition, a 1.800 minimum grade-point average requirement after the second season of competition and thereafter a 2.000 minimum grade-point average for eligibility.

The proposal has a delayed effective date of August 1, 1990, so it will apply only to student-athletes first entering your institutions after the 1989-90 academic year. Now, we have heard concerns expressed in the past, and indeed this morning in the Division I-A meeting, that this is not a workable rule because of the different grading systems at various universities. I can assure you on the basis of our experience in the Big Ten that it is workable. It has worked well for many years in our conference with 10 institutions with very different grading systems. We have institutions on a 6.000 system, a 5.000 system and a 4.000 system; and it is possible to make the adjustments necessary to operate under this rule.

Comment also was made earlier today that the Academic Requirements Committee felt no changes should be made in Bylaw 5-1-(j) until we have more experience about the rule. I don't really feel that concern applies to Proposal 53, because it doesn't deal with initial eligibility but rather defines more in detail the satisfactory-progress rule that we have. I urge you to take this action to support Proposal 53. Let's take a big step forward in requiring student-athletes to make realistic progress toward graduation. The eyes of many critics are on us. Let's show we are serious about wanting the student-athletes to graduate. Proposal 53 is an opportunity to do so. I urge you to vote yes on Proposal 53.

E. J. McDonald (Duke University): I stand to speak in opposition

to Proposal 53 and will do so also on Proposition 52, which will follow. I do so quite strongly; although, I do it with a real sense of ambivalence, ambivalence because we very much applaud the objectives that motivate these proposals. We also respect the way in which those objectives are accomplished in the sponsoring institutions. The truth is, Mr. Chair and delegates, that these formulations simply don't fit other institutions of equal motivation, of equal mindedness and of equal determination to assure the satisfactory-progress to degrees.

For example, they don't fit our own institution, which is on a semester-course credit rather than a semester-hour or quarter-hour plan with continuation and satisfactory-progress policies based on courses passed with certain grades earned rather than GPAs.

Three questions, I think, will highlight our concern. First, do all Division I schools uniformly use GPAs as a factor in measuring continuation, satisfactory-progress or graduation? The answer is no. Secondly, do all Division I schools allow students to withdraw from courses right up to the final examination, with the dropped course being removed from the record? No. Third, do all Division I schools remove grades of "F" or "D" when courses are repeated? No. The answer to all of these questions is, of course, no; yet the answers to Questions two and three are, as I understand it, in the affirmative in the sponsoring institutions.

Thus, a uniform GPA standard applied across all of the Division I schools truly does compare apples and oranges. Obviously, it would be inequitable. In truth, Mr. Chair and delegates, we see this as describing a Cinderella slipper that simply does not fit. We urge the delegates and the Convention to vote against these proposals.

David H. Bennett (Syracuse University): Mr. Chair, as the mover of the resolution has reminded us, this has become almost perennial at NCAA Conventions. It comes before us again without the endorsement of the NCAA Council. It comes without having elicited the interest or support of the Presidents Commission. With the opposition of the Academic Requirements Committee, the arguments made last year in Nashville and those we just heard again today are powerful; and many who have responded to the widespread campus and press criticism of the NCAA perhaps were not aware of those powerful arguments. They are that this is an unwarranted and unwise intrusion into our institutional autonomy for the very reasons the delegate from Duke suggested and that this might encourage students to take weaker programs or on the other hand might encourage institutions to lower their standards.

Perhaps that is the reason why the NCAA Council and why the Presidents Commission and why the Committee on Academic Requirements have refused to sponsor it. What is the argument in favor? The argument in favor of this, as all of us know in this room, simply is that there are substantial numbers of institutions in which the graduation rate for student-athletes is minimal. That is because student-athletes move through their four years with grade-point averages so low that they stand no reasonable chance of receiving

any degree at the end of their academic career. The argument that this is an intrusion on the institution's autonomy is an interesting one; but we must recall that this is a strange body, the NCAA, in which all of the institutions already surrender a good deal of institutional autonomy in the area of athletics. That is what we did with Proposition 48. That is what we did with Proposition 56 back in 1983. Now, it may be said by some more selective institutions that the 700 SAT standard doesn't cut. Well, the principle is the same. We have surrendered a certain measure of institutional autonomy in the area of eligibility for athletics competition, and we have done so for the benefit of the entire membership in intercollegiate athletics in the United States.

So, I am not impressed by the argument for institutional autonomy; although, I recognize this will serve as an awkward and difficult procedure for a very small percentage, five or six percent of the institutions with a standard 2,000 average that is now used. As far as the other arguments are concerned against it, and one that was shared earlier, we asked why is the Academic Requirements Committee opposed? In addition to the fact that it might intrude on 5-1-(j), I think the delegate from Minnesota has dealt with that effectively. We were told, if I understand correctly, that the higher standards at some institutions might be lowered because this is a lower standard. I ask why the introduction of such a modest standard as this should affect institutions that already have higher standards? Saying that at the present we have no standard at all, in my opinion, is not an argument that can be proposed. So the real arguments are the ones that hold that maybe this proposal would encourage students to take easier programs.

What I suggest, as most academicians do, is that we do not feel that a student who has a 1,500 or a 1,950 or 1,900 average will be able to get a 2,000 if he or she goes down the line after three or four years. If they can't have dedication, maybe they should not be competing and trying to fulfill their academic program at the same time. So, the fact is that the logic that we are using here is the same logic that we used for the high schools on Proposition 48. To simply refer again to the words that were used by Chancellor Reed from Florida State University yesterday when he said that if we were serious about academics, serious about graduation rates, the only way to do that is by signaling clearly to our student-athletes that if they are not serious academically they will not be able to compete athletically.

Robert F. Steidel Jr. (University of California, Berkeley): I speak in opposition to Proposition No. 53. I might add that I have no ambivalence in my opposition. This is a problem that has been before us before at previous Conventions, and it has been defeated before. I urge that it be defeated again. This proposal is bad legislation. It is doubly bad because on the surface it looks pretty good. Who can quarrel with the further definition of academic standards particularly if it appears to raise academic standards? Well, the key phrase here is "it appears." This proposal is appearance. It masks the bad things

that it would bring with it.

One, it would discourage student-athletes from taking the more difficult course, the course for which a low grade would risk athletics ineligibility. Two, it would discourage the student-athlete from taking challenging majors. If you don't have a major in athletics eligibility, you will. It would encourage the two-track system, a track for athletes and one for nonathletes. What is important, it would accentuate the academic disparities between institutions. They do exist now, but they are somewhat peripheral. It is somewhat a fuzzy thing to say that a degree from Solid As A Rock State College is a whole lot better than one from Piece-A-Cake University. But the disparities do exist. If this legislation is passed, it is going to give this Piece-A-Cake University a whole lot more of a recruiting advantage.

If you have ever encouraged a student-athlete to take a more difficult course rather than an easy one, if you have ever encouraged a student-athlete to opt for a challenging major and fought against a major that was not right for the student-athlete or ever fought against a two-track system, you could not go for this legislation. We have a good progress rule and it works. And, it is a rule based on sound completion of degree credit. It is a solid academic floor. I can't account for the rule in Division II, and I can't account for my colleagues in the Big Ten; but I do wish that we could stop it right here. Please vote "no" on this legislation.

Chapin D. Clark (University of Oregon): I am not going to follow my notes. Most of these points already have been made. I am concerned about legislation that raises basic questions of fairness in application across the whole country with a standard that can never be made objective, given the variations in the programs in institutions and the way in which we calculate this supposedly objective criteria. It is an illusion of precision, precision that apparently comes from the fact that it is a number—2,000 and 1,800 or whatever. But, behind that preciseness is the illusion because it is not based on the same system to calculate those numbers. It seems to me that what we need is some answers. If one institution gives a 2,500 for a C and another institution does not, is that important? How many institutions have disparities like that? Does it matter that my institution measures progress in the passing of a percentage of work attempted rather than on a GPA, or that my student-athlete would be subjected to two different standards, which would not be true with other institutions? To what extent is that true? It seems to me that the debate I have listened to starts with certain assumptions that lead us to give conclusions. But, we are replotting the same old ground without getting at some of the information that would be helpful in answering some of these questions.

Basically, to me, if we embark on a new regulatory approach, and goodness knows, a highly regulated enterprise, and we move into the area of measuring quality, success of students with a number, which is virtually meaningless on a national level, we ought to know more than listening to people like me get up here and make speeches. We

ought to have a study and get some information that will be helpful.

Michael T. Bowers (University of California, Santa Barbara): I am amazed at the kind of analysis that takes place about numbers when it is supplied for our own student-athletes in trying to measure progress in our institutions. We impress upon our high school students the 2.000 grade-point average or the 700 on the SAT. It is astounding how in their eyes it is meaningful, but the current numbers are not meaningful. I also am amazed at the number of reasons that can be brought forward for not having students progress in a regular way toward graduation at our institutions and disappointed by my colleague at UC Berkeley that he can't support this legislation.

I think this is good legislation. I am interested in education. I am interested in students making progress for a degree. If they are sitting at a 1.600 grade-point average all the way through, they are not going to graduate, I don't care what. We need some measure. Whether this is perfect or imperfect legislation, it is a start. I urge your support of it.

[Proposal No. 53 (Page A-55) was defeated by Division I, 113-194; considered prior to No. 52 after the Convention approved the change in order.]

Satisfactory Progress

James W. Lessig (Mid-American Athletic Conference): I would like to move the adoption of Proposal No. 52.

[The motion was seconded.]

It would be my hope that those who voted in the negative on Proposal 53 would listen to the merits of Proposal 52, since I believe it addresses many of the stated objections. Over the past several years, there has been a great deal of debate and discussion, as we have had today, at these annual Conventions concerning the requirements of the grade-point average for satisfactory progress. The grade-point average, as outlined in Proposal 52, is the third and final piece of the academic puzzle.

Several years ago, we passed Bylaw 5-1-(j), which gave us some assurance that those young people coming to our collegiate institutions to participate in athletics were capable of doing college-level work and completing the courses necessary for a degree. Prior to that, we had passed the satisfactory-progress rule, which was a meaningful step to insure that student-athletes were making progress toward a degree. Both of these measures were put in place to increase the opportunity that our student-athletes will graduate, a goal that I hope we all share.

But, there is still one important component missing: some type of minimum grade-point average. Without a minimum grade-point average, we really do not have satisfactory progress; we only have progress. Several institutions have argued that it is unfair to expect freshmen who undertake a different course load to receive 1.600 in their first year. This proposal eliminates that concern. Under

Proposal 52, there is no average required during the first two years of enrollment. By the beginning of the third year, which is at the same time as the student-athlete is required to declare a major, a minimum grade-point average of 2.000 is required to be eligible. Also similar to our current progress rule, the student-athlete, if eligible at the beginning of the fall term, could not lose that eligibility during the balance of the year. If the student-athlete is ineligible at the beginning of the fall term, he or she can regain eligibility by achieving a 2.000 average at the end of any term.

Some have debated that a quality-point average would be a matter of institutional autonomy, that the logic is that we should have very few NCAA rules and simply allow each institution to conduct its athletics program by its own set of rules. The bottom line simply is doing everything possible to insure that our student-athletes graduate. Just passing the required number of credit hours or doing it for 1.300 or 1.400 will not result in a degree for any student. There may be some, but I don't know of any institutions where a student can receive a degree with less than a 2.000 cumulative-point average. If we are serious about the graduation of our student-athletes, let's complete the necessary requirements. Progress alone will not guarantee graduation. Satisfactory progress, which can only be accomplished with the minimum grade-point average, will.

Please note that the effective date of the legislation is August 1, 1992, therefore not affecting any currently enrolled student-athletes. Previous speakers today have talked about the importance of sending a message to high school students about what is expected of them at the collegiate level to be eligible. Proposal 52 will send that message with the effective date of August 1, 1992. In his remarks at our opening session, Executive Director Schultz asked us to be less concerned about our success on the athletics field and more concerned about the education of our student-athletes. Proposal 52 will help us meet that challenge. I urge your support.

Homer C. Rice (Georgia Institute of Technology): I speak in opposition to this proposal for the same reasons that have been stated in the other proposal. I want to give you a good example. Georgia Tech is probably the best example I can give, because that is where I am. We have a very strict, disciplined, limited curriculum program at Georgia Tech. We have worked very hard to bring our graduation from 38 to over 80 percent in the last several years. I think what we are after is graduation and that 2.000 in our last quarter. I dare say that we have several members in our conference that have a graduation rate of over 90 percent and some closer to 100 percent.

If this were passed, this would jeopardize what we are working for, graduation; because we would have several of our student-athletes who would be ineligible in the last two years because several of them had not reached that 2.000. Therefore, your lack of motivation will actually decrease the graduation rate.

Robert F. Steidel Jr. (University of California, Berkeley): I have only one question, and I believe it is directed to the staff. That is, if

this rule is adopted, this proposal is adopted, and if I am reading Bylaw 5-1-(j) correctly, which says that only units that are accepted for degree credit can be counted. It would be my interpretation that units, the grades for units which do not apply for degree credit, will not count in the grade-point average. Is that your interpretation also?

Mr. Witte: I think your question is of such complexity that no one here feels comfortable responding to it at this time. We would have to take it to some other body, probably the Council.

Mr. Lessig: I think it is clear in the proposal that we are talking about cumulative-point average. It does not say that the 2.000 average has to be in the major in the junior year, and I think most of us understand that it would be for all courses.

Carl F. Ullrich (United States Military Academy): One of the gentlemen who spoke before on a piece of legislation asked three questions. We might add to those. Are all the credit hours of equal difficulty among institutions in the NCAA? Does a student-athlete in one institution necessarily take the same number of credit hours? The United States Military Academy is in favor of academic progress. We are not only in favor of it, but we require it. For goodness sake, if this institution in its wisdom wants to have legislation requiring some sort of grade-point average, let's come up with something that is going to be fair across the board. The Academic Requirements Committee is opposed to this, the Presidents Commission was opposed to it last year. For goodness sake, let's vote it down.

Robert F. Steidel Jr. (University of California, Berkeley): Again I rise to speak somewhat against what the representative of the Mid-American Conference said, because I don't believe that that interpretation is the way it is written. The current progress rule says that you only can count for progress those units that apply toward credit in a major. Now, if the Mid-American Conference proposal states that you can use some padded courses in order to get your grade-point average, I don't think that is appropriate; because you are going to have two different interpretations in the same rule. If we are going to use this rule to raise our standards, then we are going to have to live with it. These units will have to be those that count for satisfactory progress.

John W. Stoepler (University of Toledo): The Mid-American Conference has had a comparable rule for many years, and I would simply add that the judgments in question are made by the academic authorities in each institution. We have different systems within the conference. We have been able to work out those kinds of questions. I think that the suggestions that somehow this is an intention to impose a uniform system on every institution is simply not well founded. I think those differences can be taken into account. We have been able to do that.

[Proposal No. 52 (Page A-54) was defeated by Division I.]

[The Division I business session was recessed at 3 p.m. and reconvened at 3:15 p.m.]

Graduate Assistant Coaches

Jeffrey H. Orleans (Council of Ivy Group Presidents): On behalf of the NCAA Council, I move adoption of Proposal No. 64.

[The motion was seconded.]

This proposal arose in the Council, and it seems to be clear that graduate assistant coaches could receive NCAA postgraduate scholarships, which are reportable in regard to that institution, and not exceed the allowable financial limits. It could be referred to the Committee on Financial Management, which recommended that this same permission be granted to all graduate professional fellowships that are administered outside the institution. That is to say, those that are not institution specific but awarded on some outside basis. On that basis, the Financial Aid Committee unanimously recommended enactment of the proposal and the Council urges its enactment this afternoon.

[Proposal No. 64 (Page A-65) was approved.]

Maximum Awards—Division I Women's Volleyball

Margie McDonald (High Country Athletic Conference): On behalf of the sponsors of this proposal, I move the adoption of Proposal No. 65.

[The motion was seconded.]

Along with football, women's volleyball is a head-count sport with its traditional season in the fall. The nontraditional season is in the spring. This proposal would retain the 12 head-count limit for women's volleyball and allow the institution to maintain 12 athletes on grants-in-aid for both the traditional and nontraditional seasons. Presently, if an athlete graduates at midyear, her grant-in-aid will not be passed to another student-athlete in volleyball without counting as an additional award. In essence, it reduces the squad size from the nontraditional season. If Proposal 65 passes, the institution is given the option to replace that scholarship athlete without counting the aid twice in the same academic year, which is currently the case in football concerning initial awards. I urge your support for Proposition No. 65.

[Proposal No. 65 (Page A-65) was approved by Division I.]

Recruiting Contacts and Evaluation Activities

Robert R. Snell (Kansas State University): On behalf of the Council, I would like to move adoption of Proposal No. 84.

[The motion was seconded.]

This proposal further defines the recruiting contact of the evaluation activities by prohibiting the in-person contact with the evaluation of the prospective student-athlete by Division I member institutions' coaching staff on or off the campus in conjunction with any athletics event involving prospective student-athletes in sports of football and basketball if that prospective student-athlete is participating in either of those sports. The Council and members of the NCAA Recruiting Committee support this proposal inasmuch as considerable concern has been expressed regarding the recruiting advantage realized by the institution that hosts outside groups for events such as

high school all-star games or state tournaments on their campuses outside the contact and evaluation period. Currently, the contact-evaluation period does not apply to institutional staff members with respect to prospective athletes if the event is held on their campuses. I urge your support of this proposal.

[Proposal No. 84 (Page A-80) was approved by Division I.]

Contact and Evaluation Periods—Division I Men's Basketball

Bill Menefee (Baylor University): I move adoption of Proposal No. 88-A and B.

[The motion was seconded.]

The NCAA Recruiting Committee has recommended and the NCAA Council has supported the adoption of this amendment, which will adjust the Division I men's basketball contact and evaluation periods to permit such activities on specified dates without expanding the total number of days on which such activities may occur. This proposal makes only minimum adjustment and allows our basketball coaches a better opportunity to contact and evaluate prospects during their seasons. I urge your support of this proposal.

[Proposal No. 88 (Page A-87) was approved by Division I.]

Contact and Evaluation Periods—Division I Women's Basketball

Ann Marie Lawler (University of Florida): I move adoption of Proposal No. 89.

[The motion was seconded.]

The NCAA Recruiting Committee has reviewed closely the contact and evaluation period for Division I women's basketball and based on wide support of member institutions has recommended the adjustments in Bylaws 1-2-(ii) and 1-2-(iii) that you see under No. 89. There is no increase in either the contact or the evaluation period if this amendment is adopted. Its purpose is to establish April 16th as the end of the spring contact period and to reduce by seven days the evaluation calendar.

Also, the proposal, if adopted, will permit the December evaluation period to begin one week earlier in order to provide evaluation opportunities during the official tryouts for the Olympic Festival and to adjust the evaluation dates for those states that play high school basketball in the fall. The Women's Basketball Coaches Association overwhelmingly has supported this. I urge your support.

[Proposal No. 89 (Page A-88) was approved by Division I.]

Printed Recruiting Aids—Division I

James W. Lessig (Mid-American Athletic Conference): On behalf of the NCAA Council, I move adoption of Proposal No. 99.

[The motion was seconded.]

This proposal would amend the list of recruiting aids that a Division I institution is permitted to send to prospective student-athletes in three ways. One specifies that an institution may provide prospective student-athletes either an annual athletics press guide or an annual athletics recruiting brochure. Current NCAA legislation allows an institution to provide both of these items to prospective

student-athletes. Also, it would eliminate game programs as a permissible recruiting aid and add as a permissible recruiting aid a student-athlete handbook to describe the institution's athletics department policies governing the conduct of student-athletes. Only one-color printing could be used throughout this sample.

The Council supports this proposal, citing the duplication of effort and costs involved in sending prospective student-athletes both the recruiting brochure and media guide. This proposal is considered cost saving in nature, inasmuch as it reduces the number of permissible recruiting aids by the total of one. Finally, the addition of the student handbook will provide prospective student-athletes more detailed information regarding the athletics department policies. I urge your support of this proposal. Thank you.

[Proposal No. 99 (Page A-93) was approved by Division I.]

Official Visits—Division I Basketball

Victor A. Bubas (Sun Belt Conference): On behalf of the NCAA Council, I move the adoption of Proposal No. 101.

[The motion was seconded.]

This proposal will increase from 15 to 16 the total number of paid visits that a Division I member institution may provide prospective student-athletes annually in basketball. The Council and members of the NCAA Recruiting Committee support this proposal to restore the number of permissible campus visits by the prospective student-athlete to 18, which was the number previously permitted when the scholarship limit for the sport of basketball was 15. During the January 1987 NCAA Convention, that scholarship limit was reduced from 15 to 13, and the visitation limit was similarly reduced from 18 to 15. When the scholarship limit was restored to 15 at the 1987 special Convention, the number of visitations was not increased similarly to 18. I urge your support of this proposal.

[Proposal No. 101 (Page A-94) was approved by Division I, 189-120.]

Seasons of Competition—Division I Hardship Exception

Joe Gottfried (University of South Alabama): Mr. Chair, I move adoption of Proposal No. 120.

[The motion was seconded.]

At the present time, the bylaws prohibit a junior college student who is injured or ill at the junior college to qualify for a hardship waiver at the time the student transfers to a Division I institution. Therefore, a junior college student who has suffered an injury or becomes ill may have an extended year under the hardship provision only if the student transfers to a Division II or Division III institution. It is highly unfair to the colleges and universities and various divisions, but it is patently unfair to the student-athlete who begins an athletics program in a junior college and who has aspirations of competing with Division I athletes. The same mechanisms are there that we use for four-year institutions. Number one, we must have communication with the director of athletics at the junior college

certifying in writing, and with copies of information proving, that the athlete did or did not participate in less than 20 percent of the activities. Secondly, certification in writing from a physician stating that the athlete was incapable of participation. We need to rely on medical integrity of the physician in the junior college community the same as we do that of the physician in a four-year college. Thirdly, this information is then forwarded to the conference office for a decision. My suggestion here is that the conference office can do a more thorough in-depth investigation as it relates to the junior college hardship.

I understand that the NCAA has no control over the junior colleges, and there may be a concern about abuse. But, please let's not categorize all junior colleges as having no integrity. Many of you who have a fear of abuses are overlooking the fact that by passing this proposition we would help the athlete. The University of South Alabama would submit that in carrying out fundamental policy of the NCAA, in fairness to all students, that this proposition be adopted. Thank you.

Douglas S. Hobbs (University of California, Los Angeles): On behalf of the NCAA Council, I urge that this proposal be defeated. The Council has several concerns, several of which have been referred to by the mover; and additionally, the problem that those who would be critical to the certification process are not subject to the NCAA enforcement procedure. There is a further consultative factor and that is that junior college personnel are not familiar with NCAA rules, regulations, and more importantly, terminology. For example, we have our own peculiar definitions of competitions, some of which can be found in Case 286. I think on balance that the Council figures this would be opening up a can of worms, and it would cause all sorts of problems and frictions among member institutions and perhaps between member institutions and junior colleges.

[Proposal No. 120 (Page A-108) was defeated by Division I.]

Seasons of Competition—Skiing

Bill Marolt (University of Colorado): On behalf of the NCAA Men's and Women's Skiing Committee, I move for adoption of Proposal No. 121.

[The motion was seconded.]

In the sport of skiing, as in ice hockey, we have a number of our athletes who have developed in local club programs as part of our Olympic development effort. A commitment to the national teams as well as to the Olympic teams continues beyond high school graduation. As a result, we have a number of youngsters who arrive at our campuses older than most of our entering freshmen. Because of this, we are asking that athletes who come during a noncollegiate competitive season not be penalized and lose one year of competition. Everyone on the skiing committee feels this is an important part of our program and also an important part of our development of international skiing teams. We urge your support.

Charles Whitcomb (San Jose State University): On behalf of the NCAA Council, I urge the defeat of Proposal No. 121 on the basis that this should come back before the Convention and apply to all sports or none at all.

Joseph R. Geraud (University of Wyoming): I would urge your support for adoption of Proposal No. 121. I appreciate the concern just expressed in terms of the proposal, that perhaps it should apply to all sports. But such was not the approach taken last year at the Convention when it was approved for the sport of hockey. So I would suggest that there is no great harm to this Convention or to the Council if, in fact, you do support this amendment that would give skiing the same position as you gave hockey last year.

Linda K. Estes (University of New Mexico): I also would like to encourage you to support this proposal. Skiing is different from other sports. Normally, skiers don't ski on high school teams; they ski on club teams and often go from high school to national teams before they come back to the colleges. This passed without a whimper for hockey last year, and skiing should have been included at that time. I don't recall the Council getting up and opposing the amendment for hockey. I would just like to say that really I think you ought to support this, and we don't want the Council to bat 100 percent in here today.

Margie McDonald (High Country Athletic Conference): We would like to urge you to support this proposal for all the various reasons that we have heard from the previous speakers. If the Council is concerned, as it should be, of it being applicable to all sports, I suggest that we would be happy to propose that kind of proposal for next year.

[Proposal No. 121 (Page A-108) was approved by Division I, 166-79.]

Playing Seasons—Division I Baseball

Donald W. Zacharias (Mississippi State University): I would like to move adoption of Proposal No. 131.

[The motion was seconded.]

The passage of this proposal would allow college baseball coaches to continue to coach summer teams as they have done for as long as college and summer baseball have been in existence. The baseball players in your school are going to be playing summer baseball, and it is preferable to have them playing for a coach that has a sound educational philosophy. Having coaches work the summer teams has not been abused. If it had been, I assure you it would have been an issue with the College Baseball Coaches Association. It never has been an issue. If this proposal fails, it will be extremely detrimental to college baseball players and at the same time devastating to many college summer leagues. I urge your acceptance of this proposal.

Glen C. Tuckett (Brigham Young University): I speak in favor of Proposal No. 131 for many of the same reasons as the previous speaker. Just a little bit of background, in case anyone is afraid of this, to allay any fears. The approval of this proposal will limit the

application of the 26-week playing-season limitation to the academic year rather than the calendar year and will not increase the number of days during the school year to the team or to individual practice. It will not increase the number of games played during the school year. That already is regulated by our Association. It will not impose additional time demands on the student-athlete. All it will do is allow a young man under the guidance of his coach, if he so desires, to participate in the summer. We urge your approval.

Robert R. Snell (Kansas State University): I hesitate to say this; but on behalf of the Council, I wish to speak in opposition to this proposal. It would reopen the summer baseball practice and competition issue. This is a significant control that was recently adopted, 26-week playing-season limitation; and that legislation was only adopted in 1987. It was amended in 1988, and now we have another proposal to amend it in 1989. If we really wish to reconsider this issue, we should probably be looking at all sports and not just baseball. I urge your opposition to this proposal.

Ronald J. Maestri (University of New Orleans): This will not in any way alter the 26-week period. It does not in any way alter the number of contests that are played during the year. Baseball has been played traditionally in the summertime. I think what we see here is that our coaches, if there is one youngster on a summer team from the same institution, according to the rule as it is today, cannot participate in any way in coaching that particular team. It would not allow any more than four individuals from the same university playing on a particular summer team. As we all know, I would like to think that we would encourage our young people to participate in some activity in the summertime. This has not been, in fact, an abused situation.

[Proposal No. 131 (Page A-116) was approved by Division I, 158-126.]

Preseason National Invitation Tournament

From the floor: I move the adoption of Proposal No. 133.

[The motion was seconded.]

Proposal No. 133 is intended to enable the preseason National Invitation Tournament to be played from a period from November 14th through November 30th. In the past, the tournament was restricted to the last two weekends in November. For the most part, these dates do not present any problems for the tournament. However, on some occasions, such circumstances as an early Thanksgiving holiday, home football games and the shortness of travel time between games did result in a hardship for some of our participants. Proposal 133 is designed to enable member institutions to participate in the NIT. However, the NIT will have no impact on lost class time; and therefore, the NIT wishes to assure the membership that no team participating in the tournament will be playing a game for more than one day outside of the current period. Since no one participates in the tournament more than once every four years, the maximum amount

of lost class time that would result from this legislation would be one day in any four-year period.

[Proposal No. 133 (Page A-116) was approved by Division I.]

Resolution: Division I Men's Basketball Championship

Edward B. Fort (North Carolina A&T State University): I move the adoption of Resolution No. 148.

[The motion was seconded.]

I rise at this occasion for the purpose of stating opposition to the posture articulated by the Division I Men's Basketball Committee as then supported by the Executive Committee of the NCAA. I would like to rearticulate the five or six reasons I presented this morning and would urge the colleagues who spoke on behalf of my position to repeat their presentations.

I think that the bottom line is twofold with regard to this resolution and the reason why our university has taken this position. Number one, we have a situation wherein this organization is supporting rules that are proposed as a take-away. Secondly, I have observed that there was nothing safe or sacrosanct about 30 slots as the number in relationship to the issue of who participates in the initial rounds leading to the Final Four in basketball for men.

The background on this is that, once again, the NCAA finds itself on the horns of a dilemma as associated with the issue of lack of equity. The Division I Men's Basketball Committee, in recommending a change in the tournament's procedural guidelines, is advocating a system that, as we see it, does nothing more than promulgate the disequalization of athletics opportunity for a number of universities and colleges, not the least of which are historically black campuses.

Let me articulate the six reasons for my opposition. Number one, the new procedures are unequal in intradivisional treatment. At the present time and under the present system, it is very difficult for historically black universities and colleges in Division I basketball to fulfill their Division I schedule commitments absent the cooperation of other Division I schools—that is those that are willing to play these campuses. We certainly cannot arrange a schedule that involves only intraleague play. Hence, a campus like North Carolina A&T State University, which is the largest black campus in North Carolina, must, if you will, throw itself on the mercy of other Division I schools nationally that express a willingness to schedule our team in their arenas. I find it rather strange that even when we are fortunate enough to secure the "yes" vote of agreement with respect to playing with those schools, those games more often than not are played on a home-court basis only—that is the home court of the Division I basketball opponent. We very seldom find ourselves in a situation wherein during our past seven years of winning the league tournament that we, in fact, have hosted a major university on our campus. This arrangement has always been sort of a sweetheart deal, if you will, involving our team playing their team on their home court. We have been willing to accept this implied status of denigration

because of our sincere desire to assure that our kids get a chance to play Division I basketball even if it involves a play-off situation where we may only compete with teams on their home grounds.

Number two, it would appear that the passage of this legislation would involve the absence of black schools in the pool or at best very few. Once again, these campuses, therefore, will not share in the wealth that is associated with first-round play in the NCAA. Last year, as I indicated this morning, we came in with approximately more than \$200,000 just for hosting in the first round. Even after this money was split with the league, there still was substantial money for purposes of accommodating and enhancing our needs within the arena of basketball for Division I at A&T. With the elimination of this automatic-qualification proviso on the target date of 1991, the chances of historically black universities getting into the NCAA play-offs are slim. Hence, the situation again is where the haves are perpetuated and the have nots are given the stigma of having to stay out.

Number three is historical. I called it, as I mentioned it this morning, the West Texas scenario. The NCAA and its basketball committee has never forgotten the experience involving that small team that came out of nowhere called Texas Western, now the University of Texas, El Paso, some 23 years ago. We recall the story. The team fielded five black players, made the Final Four, and a week later the rest was history. They won the NCAA championship. There are those who resolved that that never again would happen. Under these rules, they probably are right.

Number four is the old dodge regarding the strength of scheduling argument. You know, it suggests that on the basis of a computerized analysis of strength of schedule, you can in that way make some objective decision with regard to who gets in to play as part of the pool. My view, speaking for my university, is that that argument does not wash; and it means, for example, that a team with a 30-1 record could end up not being selected to go in the automatic-berth posture, as far as round one of the NCAA play-offs are concerned in basketball. How can a team with a 30-1 record get the experience of playing majors if the majors are not willing to schedule them?

Then, number five: at least a play-off. Now, the basketball committee has justified its reasons for elimination of the bottom two schools from the automatic berth. If that rule is continued, we could eventually have a situation where there are 32 qualifiers vying for no more than a maximum of 30 slots. I say nonsense. You just apply the rule of conscience, work your way out of that box canyon by asking that the bottom teams, perhaps two, maybe even four, vie for those slots on a play-off basis.

Finally, number six, which is a variation of No. 5. I asked the question why no play-off for the spots. If the NCAA basketball committee is really committed to the issue of equity, then at the very least it can rearrange the turf as far as these recommendations are concerned by suggesting those teams in the bottom 10 of the teams

vying for an automatic berth expose themselves to play-off competition. With the play-off results intact, it would be possible then to identify teams that are going to be provided automatically with an opportunity to go into the first rounds and would be given a chance at the brass ring by pretournament play-off competition. Now, that is the least desirable as far as compromises for the tournament are concerned, because even then those that have to involve themselves in this pretournament play-off basically are taking second fiddle.

The bottom line is simple; and, Mr. Chair, I will conclude. The NCAA Division I Men's Basketball Committee has failed to uphold the responsibilities associated with the issue on the factual basis of equity, at least. This rule, and its stated intent to the contrary notwithstanding, will result in elimination of large numbers, as I see it, of the campus participation in the automatic-berth competition. If we go along and allow our kids to return to the days of Camelot, then I would suggest that we be up front enough to involve ourselves in a process whereby equity becomes the order of the day. Yes, morally, it is the right thing to do. I, therefore, urge very strongly that you support the posture taken by North Carolina A&T State University as embodied in Resolution No. 148 and, therefore, as far as Division I is concerned, overturn the posture maintained by the basketball committee.

Frederick S. Humphries (Florida A&M University): Mr. Chair, I would like to speak in support of Chancellor Fort's resolution as pertaining to the Division I Men's Basketball Committee and the Executive Committee actions. The Division I structure of the NCAA is a derivative of I-A, I-AA and I-AAA. Over the years, all of us have had input in making this division what it is, its strength and character coordinated to a high level quality of basketball in our country. I cannot understand the logic. If we have 32 conferences in Division I with 64 slots, I do not understand the logic of how it is that we would want to limit the automatic qualifiers to just 30 as opposed to the 32 conferences that we have in Division I.

It seems to me that in our NCAA organization conferences are desired. The conference structure itself allows the fulfillment of the rules and regulations of the NCAA. It is a mechanism by which we strengthen the integrity of the organization. It is a mechanism by which we assure our ability to adhere to the things that we do in this organization. Therefore, it seems to me that if there are any positives to a group, any instruments in the Association that ought to be recognized first, the conferences are. Therefore, it seems to me that we also should want the conferences to play a vital role in our championship activities.

We now are pressed to the process of looking at reorganization of the NCAA. We have heard talk at this Convention that we need to strengthen Division II and take some teams out of Division I and put them in Division II and move some teams up from Division III to Division II. It seems to me we should let that mechanism work without putting the impact on the conferences in Division I. Now, we

talk about athletics. We pay a lot of homage to the athlete and athletics in competition in the NCAA organization. We talk about how we ought to have team play and cooperation, and that the individuals should be subject to team desires and the play should be subject to the team's wishes. It seems to me that the least that we can do is protect those conferences that we have now in Division I; and by any kind of criteria that we would set up for future competition, we should grandfather in every current conference as an automatic qualifier in Division I. That seems to be fair.

If we were talking of any other agency besides the NCAA, if we were dealing with the Federal government or even in our own states, if we were trying to take away something which we have, we would insist that that be grandfathered in before we allow anybody else to participate. We would not tolerate somebody telling us that we are going to lose something of that which we have. So, I would urge the support for Chancellor Fort's resolution on the basis that we should protect the conferences that we have in this Association for all of the reasons I have stated and that we vote Chancellor Fort's resolution in with the notion to grandfather in the conferences with automatic qualifiers and then recognize the problem of conferences getting in Division I and say they have to abide by it. But, we should protect those that are in this division now as automatic qualifiers.

Jeffrey H. Orleans (Council of Ivy Group Presidents): I find this a difficult resolution to consider; because in many respects, it is premature. The basketball committee and the Executive Committee have not concluded their consideration of the automatic-qualifier issue in Division I. Indeed, they have invited Division I institutions and conferences to continue to submit comments about the best way to deal with the tournament beginning in 1990-1991. We have a long and I think wise tradition of not wanting to overturn the decisions of the sports committees and the Executive Committee and not wanting particularly to overturn those decisions before they are final.

Since this issue is on the floor, it does seem to me to be important to note two things about it. One is that as the basketball committee has continued its decision-making process, it has heard continually and emphatically from both the Collegiate Commissioners Association and the University Commissioners Association strong preference for some sort of play-off system. The major issue to that basketball committee decision is that it has chosen to take a different attack and apply criteria that specifically would exclude the particular conference rather than really relegate them to playing off. The scheduled criteria by which the committee would propose to do that, I think even the committee will acknowledge, are as yet imperfect and imprecise and ambiguous and difficult to fulfill. It is in that spirit that it seems to me that we should support Chancellor Fort's resolution to emphasize to the basketball committee that any system that it designs and submits to the Executive Committee ought to be clear and able to be followed, if possible. Yet, we don't have that system from the basketball committee despite its very diligent and entirely honest

efforts.

I will note one last point in Chancellor Fort's criticizing of the basketball committee for suggesting the conferences be selected solely on the basis of basketball criteria. I have no disagreement with the committee's belief that we should use basketball criteria to select conferences for automatic qualification. My disagreement is whether in applying those criteria, we will give all conferences the chance on the floor to apply their weight in the tournament, or apply basketball criteria and some conference champions at the end of the season.

Ronald D. Stephenson (Big Sky Conference): While I find it difficult to stand and speak against my friends in the Ivy Group, I must speak in opposition to Chancellor Fort's resolution and in support of the Division I Men's Basketball Committee decision to select the 30 automatic qualifying conferences solely on the basis of basketball criteria. In this organization, there are bound to be differences of opinion on matters that affect the membership in this organization. Certainly, the Division I men's basketball tournament and access thereto is such an issue. While none of us may agree in total with every action taken by the basketball committee, or any other committee for that matter, none of us can deny that we have had ample opportunity for input to the committee in this case. The committee has, in fact, solicited input over the past two or three years from all constituencies in Division I.

Several years ago, at a previous Convention, a compromise was reached whereby it expanded to 64 teams, with the assurance that 30 Division I conferences would continue to receive automatic qualification into the tournament. There were no guarantees or promises to expand beyond 30. I was a party to that compromise, because I felt that it was in the best interest of the total Division I membership at that time. I feel it to be in the best interest of the total Division I membership at the present time. While I personally would have preferred the NCAA conduct a play-off among the bottom four champions, I understand the decision not to do so. While I may not agree with that decision, it is my feeling that it is time to bury the hatchet and vote. I urge the membership to defeat the resolution.

Thomas E. Yeager (Colonial Athletic Association): I also rise to speak in opposition to this resolution. Division I men's basketball is the only sport within the NCAA where automatic qualification can be earned legislatively. In every other sport, the respective sports committees look at the excellence in that sport, in the conference, in choosing when to award automatic bids in a particular sport. In men's basketball, if you do A, B, C and D, you are eligible for automatic qualification.

Ron Stephenson had mentioned that years ago the idea of the tournament being expanded to 64 teams with 30 automatic bids for conferences was passed. At that time, the number of conferences that were eligible was in the mid 20s. We have come to a point now where there is specifically 32 and there are several other Division I conferences supposedly on the horizon. So, it is a bigger issue for the

future. I think that in that sense, the committee in denying the idea of establishing the play-off did so because in a play-off, you are beyond the 64 teams regardless of how you try to disguise it. This committee is interested in retaining the 64 teams.

I think it is important to speak to a couple of other points that were raised in Chancellor Fort's presentation. My conference is by no means considered to be in the top echelon in Division I. This past year, we have played approximately 19 games against the so-called top-10 conferences in Division I. We had three of those 19 games on our home court. The fact is that the opportunities to schedule higher opponents who refuse to come to our institution's home courts is not based on race. It is based on a lot of other facts that affect a lot of us. I would guarantee that any of the conferences in the bottom half of the Division I structure would be unable to produce even a 50-50 home-and-home split with any nonconference schedule against the upper-level conferences. It is not a problem unique to just a small group of conferences.

I am also a member of the discussions in the University Commissioners Association and Collegiate Commissioners Association. I think that the points that have been discussed for well over a year by the basketball committee—they have met on any number of occasions as has been stated—have been reached with all due conviction. I think it is time to realize that sometimes the preferences no longer exist. I think the committee has reached what a majority—vast majority—of Division I members believe is a fair and equitable situation.

James W. Shaffer (Midwestern Collegiate Conference): This issue, obviously, has become one of the most controversial perhaps in the NCAA championship history. I also believe it has received more review and more opportunities for feedback with a fair hearing process than any other championship issue. It is time to put it to rest and accept the hard work of the Division I Men's Basketball Committee. We should move on to the new challenges that it presents to many conferences and independent institutions in motivating ourselves to become stronger. The NCAA life itself presents competitive environments for new opportunities.

The new selection process is nondiscriminatory. The proposal has elements that will require conferences and institutions to alter their commitment to Division I basketball, but they are attainable goals. Scheduling top teams at home is a problem for the majority of the conferences, including the one I represent.

Automatic qualification is not a birthright or membership service provided by the NCAA. The NCAA basketball championship is not a charitable trust fund. It is something that must be earned through innovative hard work and commitment to better yourself and not rhetorical excuses on why one cannot become stronger. All conferences, including ours, have to work hard to maintain current automatic qualification in all sports besides men's basketball and strive for commitment for those that we aren't pursuing. This issue

has been simmered, boiled, baked, fried and finally tasted. It is time to eat and swallow.

Edward B. Fort (North Carolina A&T State University): Mr. Chair, I would like to respond to the commentary of the last two distinguished colleagues as far as their representations are concerned. First of all, one does not have to be a historian to recognize the reality that baking, frying, skewering, boiling and everything else to the contrary notwithstanding, that in fact, if it takes another 100 years to get equity in relation to the resolutions of this issue, then so be it.

Number two, for anyone who is sitting in this room today to suggest to themselves that there is not some kind of ethnically related relationship between strength of scheduling, whether it is home games or home and away, they probably are looking at the red planet Mars. Number three, and I will conclude. I think that the ranking and scheduling considerations that have been defined by the basketball committee to the contrary notwithstanding, the fact still remains and defined by my colleague, President Humphries earlier today, that there is, in fact, an inherent right for teams that go all out with their kids to win that league championship to be selected automatically. Then, they are told that no, we are sorry, you just simply can't get in because there are only 30 slots. That is nonsense. There is an inherent right in the relationship because of the fact that that is what big-time sports is all about, giving these kids the opportunity to compete and to compete on some semblance of equity. On that basis if they would have, in fact, that league title, then they have the right, I suggest, to participate in postseason play at least as far as round one of the NCAA play-offs are concerned.

I would, therefore, urge strongly that you reshape the table, that you disallow the posture taken by the basketball committee and once and for all you suggest, let's move to equity.

Cedric W. Dempsey (University of Arizona): As chair of the NCAA Division I Men's Basketball Committee and on behalf of the committee, I urge the membership to defeat this resolution. The committee has spent a significant amount of time over the past two years. There have been four subcommittee meetings and three whole committee meetings in which the major part of the agenda dealt with this issue. I have spent over 35 days over the last four months dealing with this issue in talking with college administrators, talking to the University Commissioners Association, talking with athletics director and talking to basketball coaches.

The basketball committee has addressed criteria such as have been mentioned, factors other than basketball criteria, such as broad-based programs and whether or not that should be a consideration for automatic qualification into the basketball tournament. We spent a great deal of time with a great deal of sensitivity in addressing the issue of historical contributions to the tournament and in particular we talked about grandfathering historically black conferences into the tournament on an automatic basis. We talked about a play-off system and the variety of concepts dealing with that issue. We are

concerned about any decision we make as to how it might impact our decision on other sports championships in Division I.

After consideration of all of these factors, the committee decided to remain and, please note, I say remain with the principle that basketball criteria be used to determine automatic qualification for conferences. The committee concluded that it should make the selection on basketball excellence in the year that the automatic qualifiers will be participating in the tournament. Additionally, it believes that using the same type of criteria that are used to select the at-large entries is the most appropriate. The proposed criteria for selecting the 30 qualifying conferences is being distributed to conference commissioners now for their feedback, which I am sure will include institutional input.

In May, the membership will be informed of the criteria that will be used beginning with the 1991 championship. The committee feels this procedure is consistent with other championships guidelines and is the most effective way of determining the strongest field for the basketball championship. I would inform you, too, that the charge of the basketball committee is to provide the strongest possible field for a 64-team tournament. We urge your defeat of this resolution.

[Proposal No. 148 (Page A-129) was defeated by Division I.]

Edward B. Fort: (North Carolina A&T State University): May I make one statement, please?

Mr. Witte: Yes.

Mr. Fort: I think that obviously we will abide by the judgment of the body, and I want to congratulate each of you for your willingness to listen to our emanations as related to the opposing view. I would remind the body of one thing that is critically important because it is historical. You will note that the campuses that raise the banner of historically black institutions have on more than one occasion during the past seven or eight years been willing to demonstrate their involvement with and observance of the rules and regulations that are promulgated by this body, even though there are some of which they disagree, not the least of which is Proposition 48. But in conclusion, let me suggest this as a historian. There was a loud, long, and if not awesome, certainly languished view, that was picked up by the entire nation, if not the world, less than 20 years ago when a black athlete by the name of John Carlos raised the clenched fist even though he was involved as an American during the flying of the flag of these United States. My hope is that the young people today who are participants on campuses, including historically black universities, will not find themselves involved in a repeat of those kinds of demonstrations because of the fact that they might conclude that it is the only way in which they gain justice. Thank you.

WAIVERS

[Note: The Division I business session heard petitions for waivers of Division I membership criteria from Alabama State University, Grambling State University, Hardin-Simmons University and St.

Joseph's University (Pennsylvania). The petitions of Grambling State University, Hardin-Simmons University and St. Joseph's University (Pennsylvania) were approved. The petition of Alabama State University was denied.]

NOMINATING COMMITTEE

[Note: The slate for Division I representatives to the Council and Division I vice president was presented and approved.]

[The Division I business session was adjourned at 5 p.m.]

General Business Session

Wednesday Morning, January 11, 1989

The general business session was called to order at 9:00 a.m., with President Bailey presiding.

ACCEPTANCE OF REPORTS

President Bailey: The delegates will please take their seats so we can begin this meeting. In the opening session Sunday afternoon, I announced I would receive motions today to act on various reports that were identified in that session. At this time, I will entertain a motion to receive the reports of the sports and general committees of the Association as presented in the Annual Reports.

[Note: Motions were made, seconded and approved to accept the reports of the sports and standing committees, treasurer, Council, Executive Committee and Presidents Commission.]

PROPOSED AMENDMENTS

[Note: The results of votes taken in the division business sessions were reported as the proposals appeared in the Convention Program and are not reprinted here unless additional action was taken. The results also appear in the proceedings of each business session and in Appendix A.]

Consent Package—Constitution

Frederick Hemke (Northwestern University): On behalf of the Council, I would like to move adoption of Constitution Proposals Nos. 1 through 9.

[The motion was seconded.]

These proposals have been included in the consent group because they are considered to be noncontroversial. Each has the full support of the Council, and I urge the adoption of this legislation.

[Note: Proposal No. 6 was removed from the consent package.]

[Proposal Nos. 1 through 5 and 7 through 9 (Page A-2) were approved as a constitution consent package.]

Partial Qualifier

Charles Whitcomb (San Jose State University): Mr. President, on behalf of the Council, I move the adoption of Proposals Nos. 10 through 34, with the exception of Proposal 21 which the Council has withdrawn.

[The motion was seconded.]

[Note: Proposal No. 21 was withdrawn; and Nos. 16, 24 and 30

were removed from the bylaws consent package.]
[Proposal Nos. 10 through 15, 17 through 20, 22 through 23, 25 through 29 and 31 through 34 were approved as a bylaws and other legislation consent package.]

Consent Package—Deregulation/Simplification

Prentice Gautt (Big Eight Conference): Mr. Chair, I move adoption of the Proposals Nos. 35 through 38.

[The motion was seconded.]

[Note: Proposal No. 37 was removed from the consent package.]

[Proposal Nos. 35, 36 and 38 (Page A-20) were approved.]

RECONSIDERATION OF DIVISION VOTING ACTION

Reconsideration of Partial Qualifier

D. Alan Williams (University of Virginia): Mr. President, relative to Proposal No. 42, as one of those who voted on the prevailing side, I would like to move for the reconsideration of Proposition No. 42, which was defeated yesterday.

[The motion was seconded.]

We were prepared, when we came to the Convention, to vote in favor of the elimination of the partial qualifier. We, as with several other institutions, responded to the request of the Presidents Commission not to make any changes in Bylaw 5-1-(j); but upon further reflection and getting a better reading on the degree to which the Presidents Committee really discussed this, we are prepared to vote in favor of Proposition 42. We urge the membership of Division I to vote for reconsideration.

[The reconsideration of Proposal No. 42 (Page A-28) was approved, 175-137, three abstentions; roll-call vote.]

[Note: Discussion of Proposal No. 42 followed the reconsideration of Proposal No. 134 but is included here for convenience of reference.]

Harvey W. Schiller (Southeastern Conference): I again urge the Division I members to vote in support of Proposal No. 42. We had a number of people speaking to this issue yesterday, and one of the things that I think is a little suspect are the number of people that really didn't speak against an issue like this and how closely it was defeated. Regarding the comments about further study, I have been involved in the development of this proposal; and it will not affect the 10-year study, since the last cohort in Division I entered school this past fall under current legislation.

Joseph S. Boland III (Auburn University): I spoke yesterday in the Division I meeting, giving the general reasons why I support this proposition. I will not reiterate those today. I, however, would like to give you a few specific reasons. The NCAA minimal requirements for full qualifier, we all know, offers two possible reasons that a student does not meet these requirements. Some do not have the ability to meet the requirements. I submit that these have no place in our institutions and should not be admitted. The second includes those students who have the ability but are not sufficiently motivated at the

high school level to achieve the minimal standards. Proposition 42 is directed towards these students. All of us are aware that each level of academic achievement builds on all three levels. Those of us who have kids have emphasized that many times. When our kids say, "Why do I need this, dad or mom," you tell them they need it for future courses. Those individuals who are not sufficiently motivated to achieve minimal NCAA requirements as a full qualifier will have considerable difficulty succeeding at the collegiate level.

I admit that some do succeed but not without an inordinate expenditure of effort by athletics support staffs. That is time that could have been spent improving our graduation and retention rate for our qualified and motivated students. Proposal 42 will send a fair message to the junior high and senior high students. They must apply academically in order to gain financial aid during their first year. The NCAA, by adopting Propositions 48 and 46 at previous Conventions, took a bold step toward improving the academic standards of high school students. Proposition 42 will strengthen that step and will continue the process forward. I urge you to vote for Proposition 42.

Thomas E. Yeager (Colonial Athletic Association): In 1983, when the Division I delegates adopted Proposition 48, they also adopted a partial-qualifier rule to bridge the substantial jump from the old 2.000 rule to Bylaw 5-1-(j). Subsequently, we have adopted a sliding scale to further bridge that gap as a transitional rule before the full implementation of Bylaw 5-1-(j). At this time, that scale has out-lived its course and it has been phased out. It is now time also to remove the partial-qualifier bridge and enact the full requirements of Bylaw 5-1-(j).

John O. Bolvin (University of Pittsburgh): My colleague from Auburn University has given two reasons why we would consider voting for Proposition 42. I would like to give a third reason why we should vote against Proposition No. 42.

The third reason for the scores are partial qualifiers, those young people who grow up in inner city schools. I think that the persons who know anything about ETS will know that most of their reports show that the students in the low socioeconomic schools tend to do poorly on the SAT or ACT tests, not based on intelligence but based on what they have been taught through their school district. For this reason, I believe that it is important for us to maintain the partial qualifier. Almost all the data shows that the partial qualifiers are low on test scores and not on the academic preparation. If you are concerned about any reference, I recommend you talk to Dr. Lloyd Bond, University of North Carolina, who has done extensive studies on minority and low socioeconomic students on the SAT. I also remind you that there are about three states where there are lawsuits by women and by low socioeconomic minorities against the SAT and how it has discriminated.

Charles Theokas (Temple University): I stand and ask you to give very serious consideration to this. I find it interesting, being

relatively new to the NCAA, that the constant theme has been don't touch Bylaw 5-1-(j) and don't touch Prop 48. It becomes convenient for those conferences that say they won't allow us to bring in a young student-athlete, male or female, under these circumstances never to think about the young person from a low socioeconomic area who, in fact, never will have an opportunity to get the education that we talk about. I see some very selfish motives. I have talked to some coaches in those areas, at universities like Temple and many other universities, who are in the business of giving opportunity to young people, educational opportunities. Certainly those young persons don't have the money to go to school. If this passes, in my opinion, the entire concept of Bylaw 5-1-(j), Proposition 48, is thrown out the window. We penalize the student-athletes by not giving them that year of eligibility. We have kept them under Prop 48; and for selfish reasons, and we understand that makes little sense.

Now we are saying let's not even talk to these people and make the assumption that by speaking for the teachers, some seventh or eighth graders are going to learn that they have got to study. I can't believe what I am hearing this morning, and I am very emotional about it. I would like to ask how many of you people have ever talked to a person who was a Prop 48 student and who, in fact, was doing very well? We are talking about a young man or woman who would end up ten points shy, and we say you can't get a college education because you can't afford it and we are not going to do it. Please consider this very, very seriously. I just have a sense that it is going a little too quickly. I can't believe we are talking about it again this morning. Thank you.

Joe B. Wyatt (Vanderbilt University): Mr. President, I would like to speak in favor of Prop 42. We have a crisis today in this country in our middle schools and high schools, and that is what this issue is really about. The issue is to send a clear and unambiguous message to the young men and women at these middle and high schools, to their parents, their teachers, their coaches. That message is that there is no substitute for diligence in study in their chosen field of education. If the student ever loses the sequence in some subjects, particularly in math and science, it simply cannot be regained. It can't be regained in high school, if lost in middle school; and it certainly can't be regained in college if it is lost in high school. Therefore, we need to send the message that it is important for everyone to encourage these students to do their academic work. I would add, finally, that there is a provision in this rule as it is proposed for a lengthy transitional period, so there will be no major discontinuity. I urge, therefore, that you approve this resolution.

[Proposal No. 42 (Page A-28) was approved by Division I, 163-154, two abstentions; roll-call vote.]

Reconsideration of Playing Seasons—Division II Baseball

James B. Appleberry (Northern Michigan University): Division II voted on Proposal 134 yesterday, and that proposal was defeated. I have now been asked by one of my colleagues in our conference to

move for reconsideration since I was one voting on the prevailing side. I, therefore, move for reconsideration of Proposal No. 134.

[The motion was seconded.]

Christ Petrouleas (Wayne State University): I believe there are athletes in Division II that should be allowed the same opportunity and have the advantages of their coaches working with them during the summer months as Division I.

Asa N. Green (Livingston University): I urge Division II to affirm its action yesterday and defeat the motion to reconsider. You have heard me say this many times on the Convention floor. I don't think that what one division does immediately affects what Division II does, and I don't think it does in this instance. I think for what it is worth that Division I made an error, and I would like to see Division II not compound it by adopting it. I urge a "nay" vote on the reconsideration.

[Reconsideration of Proposal No. 134 (Page A-117) was approved.]

[Proposal No. 134 was defeated 66-74 by Division II.]

PROPOSED AMENDMENTS

Drug-Testing Consent Form

Diane Milutinovich (California State University, Fresno): Mr. President, I rise to speak in opposition to Proposal No. 6. Most of our institutions have not had a problem with having the student-athlete statement include the drug-testing consent form. This consent always has been part of the student-athlete's statement since drug testing was approved by the NCAA. I understand that there will be two separate forms, and they can be administered together. However, the student-athlete does not have to sign the form at that time. Some questions have not been addressed yet. One, when will the student-athlete be required to sign the consent form? Will it be before their team is selected to an NCAA championship? Two, how will sports committees know prior to selecting teams for NCAA championships that all athletes who have contributed significantly have signed the drug-testing consent form?

I think that the problem of signing the form should be solved up front in the beginning of the season and not at the end of the season when the student-athlete, team and administration could be embroiled in controversy when they should be planning to compete. In addition, if this proposal passes, it will bring about more questions regarding mandatory drug-testing programs at some of our institutions. For all of the above reasons, I urge you to defeat this proposal.

[Proposal No. 6 (Page A-5) was defeated, 365-291, after being removed from the consent package (two-thirds majority required).]

Playing Season—Football

Milo R. Lude (University of Washington): I move the adoption of Proposal No. 16.

[The motion was seconded.]

I move the adoption of Proposal No. 16—1.

[The motion was seconded.]

President Bailey, as past chair of the NCAA Postseason Football Committee, I believe that the changes that we suggest in Paragraph No. 3 will assist greatly the Postseason Football Committee with the problem that existed when we considered the move of one of the bowls to New Year's Day. We find that there is a trend now of many, many desiring to play on New Year's Day. This may help eliminate the problem or at least ease the log jam. Therefore, we urge your support of No. 16—1. Thank you, sir.

[Proposal No. 16—1 (Page A-10) was approved.]

[Proposal No. 16 (Page A-10) was approved by all divisions as amended by No. 16—1, after being removed from the consent package.]

Sports Sponsorship Criteria

Chris Voelz (University of Minnesota, Twin Cities): Mr. Chair, I have three questions I need to address to the Deregulation and Simplification Committee. One, if No. 24 passes, would, in fact, this only serve as clarification for current legislation? Two, would this, in fact, allow a non-NCAA sport, such as taekwondo, to be counted? And, three, are there any other implications for this legislation?

Donna A. Lopiano (University of Texas, Austin): Yes, yes and no. (Laughter) This motion does nothing more than confirm current practice. You currently are permitted to select one men's sport and one women's sport that is a non-NCAA championship sport to meet the minimum sports sponsorship criteria. You merely are adding the same descriptors that are used in Bylaws 1, 2 and 3 to this section, this waiver section. So that was the answer to your first question. If you wanted to select taekwondo, I suggest you do select taekwondo. I don't think there are any problems beyond that.

President Bailey: With respect to the non-NCAA sport chosen to meet the requirements, there are standards for those sports set by the Council in terms of number of participants, number of events and things of that type. A specific sport, if it meets the NCAA standards, will be accepted. I think that is the explanation.

[Proposal No. 24 (Page A-15) was approved by all divisions after being removed from the consent package.]

Committee on Women's Athletics

Robert A. Stein (University of Minnesota, Twin Cities): I will move the adoption of Proposal No. 30.

[The motion was seconded.]

[Proposal No. 30 (Page A-17) was approved by all divisions after being removed from the consent package.]

Extra Benefits

Chapin D. Clark (University of Oregon): Mr. Chair, in regard to No. 37, in the discussions at the Faculty Athletics Representatives Forum and in my conference, and I think elsewhere, there has been some confusion about what No. 37 is intended to do. The problem, I think, is in the intent or the rationale. The intent says to permit an

General Business Session _____ 283

institutional employee or representative of an institution's athletics interests to guarantee a bond for a student-athlete while retaining the prohibition against payment of the bond. The confusion seems to be that to make it permissible to guarantee a bond and if the guarantee is honored, the bond is paid. To make that impermissible is something that many of us cannot understand, because the point of guaranteeing the bond is that it may be necessary legally to pay that bond.

There may be an explanation to what really is intended here in order to answer that confusion. But hearing none, I believe this should be brought back at the next Convention, if it is necessary to correct this, with an explanation that is understandable. As a courtesy, I will move the adoption of Proposal No. 37 and urge that it be defeated with the thought that it be brought back next year, if necessary.

[Proposal No. 37 (Page A-21) was defeated after being removed from the consent package.]

Resolution: Cost Reduction

Peter Likins (Lehigh University): Mr. President, on behalf of the Presidents Commission, I submit Resolution No. 39—1. No. 39 has been withdrawn, as you will recall.

[The motion was seconded.]

Thank you, Mr. Chair. This morning, significant change can occur. The time is coming. The lines are beginning to be blurry with common images; and within the next two years, we will have to face certain economic realities in intercollegiate athletics. We better begin to get ready. That is what this resolution is all about, getting ready for reality.

Proposal No. 39 was a proposal advanced in an effort to solve a problem. It has become apparent that this particular solution is not adequate, so Proposition 39 has been withdrawn. The problem remains. The proposed Resolution No. 39—1 was intended to provide another mechanism for flushing out our increasing financial problems, and I hope you will support it. My remarks today are concentrated on the problem itself, leaving for the proposed committee the task of finding a way out of our dilemma. Unless we all recognize the problem in the same way, we never will get this problem solved. Of course, the problem is money.

We heard several speakers tell us at the NCAA National Forum one year ago that for most member institutions, costs are growing between 10 to 15 percent a year while revenues are flat and likely to remain so. These growing costs barely are sustaining our present athletics programs, with no money for new programs. Yet the rule of conscience and the law of the land mandates significant change in the sharing of resources to be devoted to women's athletics in the future. We either must expand women's sports expenditures to match more nearly the men's, or we must cut the men's expenditures to match more nearly the women's, or both. Of course, we prefer to

expand. But where is the money going to come from?

We must have instilled in a few among you the notion that sports revenues can be pumped up to meet the growing costs. That is what the 12th game in football is all about and that is the hope of those that promote commercial sponsorship of the team. We fight for a bigger piece of the pie. That is what the men's basketball war is all about. We know that. We are squabbling over money. That is what is happening here. Maybe there are still a few ADs that feel that their presidents will take their money from someone else in the university and give it to athletics, but these ADs will not last much longer at NCAA institutions. Most have come to believe that our financial problems will be solved primarily by cutting costs. Now, there are only two ways for this to happen. Either we all agree at an NCAA Convention to reduce expenditures, or we leave it up to the individual ADs to solve the problem alone.

Let's explore these two possibilities. If we force each AD to balance the budget alone, the result inevitably will be the elimination of many men's nonrevenue sports teams. That is reality. That is the only thing that an AD can do without sacrificing our critical competitive edge to the opposition. Cutting back a little bit unilaterally in the number of coaches or scholarships or recruiting can cause teams to lose, or at least that is the perception. That is unacceptable. That is unilateral disarmament, and it will not work in the NCAA. The only thing left for the athletics director to do is to cancel teams entirely. If you eliminate an athletics team for men, you actually make it easier to comply with Title IX. The temptation is irresistible. Already, we see the results of these practices in Divisions I and II, most dramatically in a few sports such as wrestling and gymnastics. We are beginning to see teams lost in track and field as well. Sadly, the sports most vulnerable are the individual sports and sports that claim our attention only in a limited competition. Knowledge of these sports will be in trouble in the next five years if we don't do something soon. Wiping out a sports team is not a happy solution, but this is the only solution that can be found if each individual AD must solve the financial problems alone.

So what are the alternatives? Is there any way for us to reduce costs without denying the college experience to these students, without disturbing the competitive balance of the NCAA? Can we cut costs together without firing anybody? Can we find a solution to the cost-reduction problem that doesn't breed much worse new problems on its own? I hope so, because the process to solve this problem together will be extremely painful. Many young people will be denied the opportunity to participate in intercollegiate athletics or even go to college at all. Coaches will lose their jobs as teams are cancelled. Eventually, our youth programs will be damaged. Women's teams will expand but only under the threat of legal action because it will be so painful as we allocate resources to women by cancelling teams for men. No one wins if we fail openly to act together.

Proposition 39 incorporates the concept and makes good sense in

the NCAA with the basic educational expense grant or "B" grant. If this concept were adopted, every student-athlete with demonstrable need receives whatever he or she requires to go to college. Any student-athlete, regardless of need, can receive the basic educational expenses, tuition and fees, and course-related books. Parents who can afford to pay room and board for their college student would be expected to do so. That is only fair and far preferable to the alternatives. The "B" grant is a good idea, but its limitation in Proposition 39 is flawed. I hope the proposed committee will find a way to make it work. If not, I hope that the committee will find other ways to reduce costs without hurting students. Let's at least try to solve this problem together. Please support this resolution. Thank you.

Christine H.B. Grant (University of Iowa): I would like to take this opportunity to thank sincerely the Presidents Commission, and especially President Likins, for the willingness to listen carefully to the concerns of several of us with regard to the original Proposition 39. I also would like to urge the Convention to support the resolution that is now before us. I concur with President Likins. We must investigate all of the options that we have to reduce the expenditures of intercollegiate athletics so that we can continue to offer broadly based programs at a collegiate level.

Sam Jankovich (University of Miami (Florida)): President Bailey, President Likins, I would like to congratulate you and the Presidents Commission on your efforts, also. I do have a concern when I look at the makeup of this committee. When you find Divisions I-A, I-AA, and I-AAA and Divisions II and III on it, I believe that the people in Division I-A have a set of problems that are entirely different than most of the makeup as far as this committee is concerned. I find it very hard to believe that one chief executive officer and one director of athletics, with the other components, really can address the serious issues as far as Division I-A athletics are concerned. One of the major problems of this industry is I really do not believe that we are addressing some of the real issues. I support this resolution, but I ask you to consider the makeup of the committee.

Robert Frank (Oregon State University): I want to underline the remarks made by the last speaker. I have the same concerns. I support the resolution but would like to see the Presidents Commission and the Council considering expanding the makeup of the committee or committees.

President Bailey: I think with respect to the points made by the last two speakers, it might be appropriate to note what we are doing with certain other committees addressing major issues of the Association, notably the Special Committee on Membership Structure chaired by Fred Jacoby. The appointment and charge there has been—the authorization is, indeed, I think, implicit in the instructions—to use the necessary consultants to assist the committee to address all of the issues involved. I submit to you that if the resolution is adopted, the structure of the committee is mandated. However,

there is the possibility of the appropriate consultants to address the issues of the last two speakers.

[Proposal No. 39—1 (Page A-26) was approved, 653-42, three abstentions; roll-call vote.]

Pell Grants

B. J. Skelton (Clemson University): Mr. President, on behalf of the Council, I move adoption of Proposal No. 40.

[The motion was seconded.]

Adoption of this proposal would permit a student-athlete, who qualifies for financial assistance under the Pell Grant program, to receive a maximum amount of institutional financial assistance and the Pell Grant if that does not exceed the total cost of the attendance at his or her institution. Current legislation limits the total amount of Pell Grant the recipient may receive, over the value of tuition, fees, room and board and required course-related books, to \$1,400 at a Division I member institution and \$900 at a Division II member institution. If this proposal is adopted, the student-athlete will be permitted to receive a combined total amount of up to the maximum amount of financial aid permitted under the NCAA constitution as set forth in Constitution 3-1-(g)-(1).

The Council believes this legislation is more appropriate than permitting the student-athlete to receive a combined total amount of financial aid that includes the full value of his or her Pell Grant award plus the value of tuition, room and board and books. Such a resolution would permit an individual to seek financial assistance beyond a cost of attendance. It is clear that Federal financial aid, including the Pell Grant, never was intended to permit a student-athlete, or any other student, to receive more than the total cost of the attendance at his or her member institution.

Consistent with commitments made for various divisions at the time the members adopted the legislation to move the financial aid limitations from the constitution to the bylaws in 1987, the Council has published interpretations to indicate that no division may exempt Pell Grant monies from the limitations imposed on individual student-athletes by the overall cap retained in the provisions of Constitution 3-1-(g)-(1). Proposal No. 56, to be considered later in the agenda, clarifies the Council's interpretation and moves certain other payments, which now is believed should have exempt status, to the constitution so that the exemption will apply to all three divisions. The Council requests your support of this proposal.

Frank R. A. Resnick (Central Connecticut State University): As director of fiscal affairs and former director of financial aid, and a member of the National Financial Aid Association's Task Force on Athletics and Financial Aid, I must stand to oppose Proposal 40 for the several reasons I stood in opposition to it last year. Financial aid is complicated, no doubt; and the issues of need-based aid and Pell Grant eligibility are not well understood. The withdrawal of Proposal 39 would seem to support that. Proposal 40 does nothing to improve

the current situation; and in fact, it will cause only further inequity in grants-in-aid policies among schools.

Proposal No. 40 is simply a rewritten statement of last year's Proposal 58 to exempt the full Pell Grant award from NCAA grant-in-aid limitations, which I will remind you was defeated in a roll-call vote, 208-100. The current Constitution 3-1-(g)-(1) already provides for the cost-of-attendance-limitation language in this proposal. Proposal 40 effectively, then, only removes the bylaw limitation, thereby providing for a possible full Pell Grant of \$2,200 above the current grant-in-aid limitation. Nothing has changed, except perhaps further inequities in the Federal program formula, that should cause you to consider changing your vote.

The Pell Grant issue continues to cause confusion. There is a constant and continuous misunderstanding that NCAA rules limit the amount of Pell Grant a student-athlete may receive. It must be made clear that that is not true. Eligible recipients receive every dollar of the Pell Grant they are entitled to. Higher grants simply reduce the costs and institutional dollars to fund the full grant-in-aid. Financial aid officers would be the first to support a student-athlete being treated like every other student and being allowed the possibility of receiving aid up to the financial aid office's cost of attendance, not some arbitrary amount. The Pell Grant is not the same financial aid program it was when this NCAA rule was conceived as a methodology to help the needy students. The Pell Grant is now only one of many Federal, state and institutional aid programs that are packaged to meet college expenses of other students and student-athletes alike.

It seems to me that the real issue is not what to do with Pell Grant money but rather how much grant-in-aid an athlete should receive based on athletics ability and demonstrated financial need. Who will benefit from this change? Very few individuals, I contend.

Wil Bailey reported in a recent article on black issues in higher education that 75 percent of the Division I institutions had costs of attendance that do not even exceed the \$1,400 additional support already allowed under the current regulations. They or their students would not benefit by this change. I would guess even further that Division II would not see any change. With the quiet passage yesterday of Proposal 68 by Division III, this proposal is effectively moot since students at those institutions cannot have all costs met and have no reason to exempt Pell Grants. Who will suffer most directly from this change? A Pell Grant increase for athletes poses problems for most black colleges according to an article in Black Colleges Sports Review. The very students and institutions that many of you profess to be concerned with helping will not benefit by the passage of this resolution. As the article further details, it likely would make it more difficult for those schools to recruit athletes to field competitive teams.

Last year, I disputed the argument that the added cash to eligible students will substantially reduce the number of athletes who signed with agents and accepted money from them. I dispute it again this

year. A few hundred dollars of additional support is not what is going to keep someone from signing with an agent. You cannot legislate morality. While I do believe very strongly in the intent to direct more funds to students who truly need them, I simply do not believe that this proposal is the answer. We need to build from some of the concepts in Proposal 39 and from the ideas and suggestions proposed in last summer's Presidents Commission Forum. We need to develop the methodology to provide the aid to meet the needs of student-athletes, whether poor or middle class, whether they are eligible or not eligible for the Pell Grant.

Don't take this currently confusing issue and confuse it more for the wrong reasons. Don't tilt the level playing field any more than it already is. The most likely candidate for Proposal 40 are the schools that already have the revenues and resources to fund their athletics grant-in-aid programs and have no further disadvantage. I urge you to defeat this proposal. Thank you very much.

Jeffrey H. Orleans (Council of Ivy Group Presidents): Speaking as a member of the Committee on Financial Aid and Amateurism, which is a Council-appointed committee, I also would urge the defeat of this proposition but, perhaps, for a slightly different reason than the previous speaker. A minute ago, when approving Resolution 39-1, this Convention took, perhaps unknowingly, a really historic step. That was to approve in the language of that resolution the idea that there is value toward moving to grants-in-aid that are based on tuition and a combination of need. That truly is a moment that reflects real change. The committee that we appointed under Resolution 39-1 gives us the opportunity in a broad base and in a responsive way to move toward that.

I simply would note that approving this Pell Grant proposal would run in exactly the opposite direction. It would provide additional financial aid for some needy students but not for others, and it would allow additional financial aid under one program but not under others. And it is, in fact, contrary to what we did a minute ago, which is to try and find a broad-base solution to the question generally. So, I would hope that we would vote this down and allow the committee that we just authorized to do its work and bring back to us a proposal for comprehensive change in financial aid that will allow us to better aid all of our students and at the same time control our costs. Thank you.

Lewis S. Salter (Wabash College): Mr. President, I am a member of the Council. There is one simple fact about this proposition that I think is worthy of note. What it does is at the very least bring the bylaws in line with our constitution. I would submit that any organization that operates with its own bylaws in contradiction to its constitution is in serious trouble. I would agree with the speaker, the one before last, that Pell Grants are indeed not well understood. I certainly would agree with the previous speaker that the new committee that we have just authorized can service all well by bringing in possibly quite new legislation that would affect the

General Business Session

289

constitution. In the meantime, I urge you to support this proposition. [Proposal No. 40 (Page A-27) was defeated by Division I, 156-157, five abstentions; by Division II, 30-133, one abstention, and by Division III, 105-114, five abstentions. All votes by roll call.] [Note: The general business session recessed for 15 minutes.]

Annual Legislative Calendar

John P. Reardon Jr. (Harvard University): Mr. President, on behalf of the Council, I move the adoption of Proposal No. 48.

[The motion was seconded.]

During the July National Forum, the membership indicated its desire to improve the Association's legislative process. Accordingly, the Council referred this issue to the Special Council Subcommittee on the Incorporation of Interpretations and Legislation in the NCAA Manual. The subcommittee's report prompted the Council to sponsor this proposal. It is designed to slow the legislative process, to provide additional time for the review and refinement of legislative proposals and to eliminate or reduce not fully conceived or formulated proposals. The proposal moves up the deadlines associated with the legislative process, including the deadline for the submission of legislation, publication of legislative proposals and the deadline associated with the submission of resolutions and amendments to amendments.

The early deadline will improve the content and format of the legislative proposals by increasing the opportunity for an earlier and more thorough review of proposed legislation by the national office and by creating a time for dialogue between sponsors, the national office and other interested parties. The creation of a Legislative Review Committee, through the approval of Proposal 76, would facilitate this legislative dialogue further. In addition, the proposal increases the minimum number of institutions necessary to sponsor a proposal and an amendment to amendment. This increase is an attempt to discourage the proliferation of special-interest legislation of limited scope and importance. In short, the proposal will encourage a more thorough and timely review of legislation prior to its submission to the membership. I urge the adoption of this legislation. There are a number of amendments that I think we have to deal with before the main proposal.

Robert W. Sankey (University of Arizona): Mr. Chair, I move the adoption of Proposal No. 48—1.

[The motion was seconded.]

As we have just heard, Proposition 48 is designed to improve the legislative process and the quality of legislation development. Amendment No. 48—1 is the first of five amendments designed to restore needed flexibility and improve or cure the opportunity of the membership to develop legislation without being unduly restricted. Now, 48—1 would require eight members to sponsor a proposal, halfway between the current six-member and the proposed 10-member requirements, and more importantly would eliminate the requirement that only five sponsors could come from within one conference. The

requirement that the legislative proposals must have support beyond a single conference is desirable in promoting qualified proposals only if that results in meaningful analysis and discussion by such sponsors. Although this may happen in some cases, I do not think it will be the norm.

The relatively short time available for member institutions to develop legislation, even if 48—2 or 48—3 are passed, makes it unlikely that members of more than one conference will have the opportunity for careful analysis and discussion. It is far more likely that legislation will be developed and debated within a single conference with sponsorship from outside of that conference being largely a courtesy rather than carefully considered support. In some cases, I believe the requirement of legislation to be sponsored beyond the single conference will be an irritation and undue limitation to the membership in developing quality legislation. I urge your support of No. 48—1.

Mr. Reardon: Mr. President, I just wanted to sort of oppose No. 48—1, simply because I think it is not a bad idea to have 10 institutions sponsor legislation; and the idea of more than one conference again is to cause the people to be more thoughtful in what they are coming up with. At the same time, this is not a kind of amendment that terribly hurts the overall legislation if it is voted in. So, I think that is how our college sees it.

[Proposal No. 48—1 (Page A-45) was approved by all divisions.]

Col. John J. Clune (U.S. Air Force Academy): Mr. Chairman, I move the adoption of Proposal No. 48—2.

[The motion was seconded.]

The present amendment requires all proposed amendments from the membership be forwarded no later than 15 April. This amendment will change that deadline to 1 July. The 1 July date will allow many, many conferences that meet in May and early June to meet and come up with legislation to meet the July 1 deadline. Additionally, the National Association of Collegiate Athletic Directors have their annual meeting the first week in June. An adjunct to that particular meeting is the meeting of Division I-A athletics directors; and again, legislation can and has come from that body after they have met. In addition, the Collegiate Football Association meets the first week in June. This is unique in that there are not only athletics directors there but faculty reps, football coaches and chief executive officers. A lot of times, this provides a platform or forum for the football coaches to discuss and come up with legislation.

So, the 1 July date would allow all those organizations, conferences and associations to meet and propose legislation and still meet the deadline. This still moves it back 90 days from where we are currently.

[Proposal No. 48—2 (Page A-46) was approved by all divisions.]

John P. Reardon Jr. (Harvard University): Mr. President, I move, on behalf of the Council and the Pacific-10 Conference, Proposal No. 48—4. Essentially, this proposal will give some flexibil-

ity for the Council at the time of the Convention without meeting the procedural requirements to propose amendments to amendments, provided each proposed amendment to amendment has been approved by two-thirds of the Council and provided the copies were distributed before or during the business sessions.

[Proposal No. 48—4 (Page A-49) was approved by all divisions.]

Mr. Reardon: No. 48—5 again provides flexibility on resolutions, which would allow the Council to go beyond the deadline set in sponsoring a resolution that may be proposed at the time of the Convention, provided the proposed resolution has been approved by two-thirds of the Council and copies distributed before or during the business sessions.

[Proposal No. 48—5 (Page A-49) was approved by all divisions.]

[Proposal No. 48 (Page A-40) was approved by all divisions as amended by Nos. 48—1, 48—2, 48—4 and 48—5.]

Obvious Qualifier

Col. Ruben A. Cubero (U.S. Air Force Academy): Mr. President, I move the adoption of Proposal No. 50.

[The motion was seconded.]

One of the administrative nightmares of Bylaw 5-1-(j) is the tremendous amount of paper work, time and money expended to certify all our student-athletes, including walk-ons, by meeting and confirming satisfactory completion of the 11 core courses at their respective high schools. Proposal 50 simply is designed to make the certification process more efficient without undermining the intent of 5-1-(j). Knowing, however, the NCAA Council's objection to the ramifications of this proposal, I would like to make two points. First, it is true and implicit in this proposal that the sponsors assume that the student-athlete who would scores at least 1,000 SAT and 23 ACT, and has a 3.000 grade-point average possesses a broad educational background that would enable him or her to complete successfully graduation requirements at our member institutions without verifying 11 core-course requirements. Second, there is nothing all-inclusive in the 11 core-course requirement as stipulated in 5-1-(j). Adequate academic preparations to work toward graduation requirements should be our major concern. The NCAA instituted the 11 core-course requirement to insure a minimum breadth of academic experience for the low end, academically qualified student-athletes, specifically those at the 700 SAT and 15 ACT levels. Once a student proves that he or she greatly exceeds these minimum scores and attains a "B" average or better, we should have great confidence in the student-athlete's ability and preparation to meet the challenges of our academic curriculum. Proposition 50 will allow us automatically to certify those obvious qualifiers for athletics programs, cut down on the unnecessary paper work and save precious time and money for those individuals involved in the certification process. I strongly urge your support of Proposal No. 50.

Raymond M. Burse (Kentucky State University): Speaking on

behalf of the Council, and as the presenter of the proposal stated, the Council is opposed to this proposal. On its face, it is a rather innocuous proposal and would lead one to believe that we are making substantial progress in the area of academics in our institutions. To present a proposal that in and of itself leaps the core-curriculum requirement is a step backwards. When 5-1-(j) was first proposed, there was substantial support that we ought to insure that our student-athletes at least take the 11 core courses. The NCAA is reviewing Forms 48-H and 48-C this year and has made modifications for the obvious qualifier in establishing some guidelines. In establishing those guidelines, the Council has gone on record as saying that the student ought to have 11 core courses with no grade below "C" in the core.

To say that a 1,300 (SAT) or a 23 or 24 ACT would assume that one has achieved all that he or she needs to be successful in college ignores those who have studied test scores very closely and note that one can achieve 1,300 or 23 on one of these standardized tests and not do very well at all in the core courses. Therefore, on behalf of the NCAA Council and on behalf of the academic integrity and academic quality of our institution, I urge you to vote against this proposal.

Jeffrey H. Orleans (Council of Ivy Group Presidents): Mr. Chair, this really is a question. My own reading of this legislation presented more than the minimum standards set forth in the necessary preceding subparagraph. It does not indicate that it waives the core-course requirement. I agree that that would be a serious issue. I just wonder if there is an official Council interpretation that sets that out.

President Bailey: That is correct. Convention Proposal No. 50, in the advisory interpretations developed by staff and the Legislation Interpretations Committee, in consultation with the sponsors, determined that notwithstanding the somewhat ambiguous wording of the proposal, that is the advisory interpretation.

Carl F. Ullrich (U.S. Military Academy): Mr. Chair, one aspect of this legislation that I think should be considered is the release of the high schools from some of the great chores that they have had in helping us with this certification and the great resistance that we have from some of them. Having these youngsters who do have these scores as indicated in this legislation will release the high schools from a great amount of the responsibility that we now put on their shoulders. I urge you to support this legislation.

Richard W. Ojakangas (University of Minnesota, Duluth): Mr. President, may I request a clarification from the chair? Did I understand you to say earlier that indeed the core curriculum, in fact, would be required in this action?

President Bailey: The advisory interpretation developed by the Interpretations Committee, with the help of staff and in consultation with the sponsors regarding intent, and in view of the somewhat difficult wording concluded that it did not require the 11 core courses.

[Proposal No. 50 (Page A-51) was defeated by Divisions I and II (Division II vote, 62-93).]

Resolution: Initial-Eligibility Clearinghouse

Michael Kasavana (Michigan State University): Mr. President, I would like to move the adoption of Proposal 51.

[The motion was seconded.]

I would like to move the adoption of Proposal No. 51—1.

[The motion was seconded.]

This proposal suggests and requests that a feasibility study be conducted to determine the practicality of or the potential for creating a clearinghouse. Most of the proposals we have just heard about, including discussion of Proposal No. 50, will be eliminated with such a clearinghouse. Yesterday, we heard one of the delegates say that to err is human and to forgive is divine. In this particular administration of Bylaw 5-1-(j), I guess the quote may be easier to ask for forgiveness than permission.

The current status is one, the inconsistency of interpretation of high school records at member institutions due to numerous ambiguities; two, excessive cost of revocation of member institutions and also high schools as just mentioned in the discussion on No. 50, and three, adjustments and subsequent readjustments in Form 48-H to create unfair recruiting advantages among member institutions. At this point, I guess it is appropriate for you not to ask what you can do for your Association but what your Association can do for you. I move adoption of the amendment to amendment No. 51—1 and urge your support.

John M. Schael (Washington University (Missouri)): Mr. President, I think we already have clearinghouses. There are over 1,000 right in this NCAA membership. Each one of our campuses has an admissions office that has the responsibility to understand the rules and regulations and to admit those students who qualify for that particular institution. Thank you.

Michael T. Bowers (University of California, Santa Barbara): Mr. Chair, I rise to speak against this proposal. I see this as a terrible bureaucratic problem for all of us faculty representatives and others who are associated with the eligibility for incoming athletes. I see no need for the central clearinghouse staffed by the NCAA when we have in our institutions and in our own conferences, competent people to evaluate these records. So, I would like to see the membership vote this down.

Mr. Kasavana: I want to remind you that this is a proposal for a study. I know yesterday that there were several discussions in Division I about a lot of things that were approved here without any information. This proposal asks for a study before we make some conclusions that were just made about competencies or incompetencies. The study is all we are talking about here.

[Proposal No. 51—1 (Page A-53) was defeated.]

[Proposal No. 51 (Page A-51) was defeated.]

Satisfactory Progress

James H. Zumberge (University of Southern California): I move

the adoption of Proposal No. 54.

[The motion was seconded.]

This amendment proposes a very modest increase in the number of units that student-athletes take each year in order to facilitate their progress toward a degree. The original intent of the satisfactory-progress rule was for 24 semester units per year to be a floor. Too often, this floor seems to have become the norm. USC and its sponsoring partners offer Proposition No. 54 as a way to increase that floor from 24 to 27 units per semester after the freshman year. If student-athletes are required to take more units per semester, then the chances will increase that they will have enough units to graduate at the time they complete their athletics eligibility.

I said that this proposal was modest. Most semester institutions require at least 120 units for graduation, and all the numbers I will give will be in semester units. Even under this new proposal, Proposal 54, a student still would need at least another semester to graduate after completing his or her eligibility. Under the existing rule, an athlete can play four seasons and still be a long way from having enough units for a degree. We propose that the NCAA make a modest step in the right direction by passing this amendment. Recognizing that the freshman year can be a difficult transition in any case, this proposal does not increase the number of units expected of freshmen; but in successive years, student-athletes would be required to take an average of 27 units per year. I should note at this time that a misstatement was added to the intent section in the Official Notice. This intent stated that the "averaging" provision is eliminated. I don't believe that this is correct. As I see it, and as I believe it is worded, the only change in the rules is to increase the number of units taken each year by student-athletes beginning in their sophomore year.

Finally, since we at the University of Southern California have implemented this policy in our own school, our student-athletes have increased the number of hours completed per year. I urge that you support this legislation.

Richard A. Rosenthal (University of Notre Dame): Mr. President, we support this proposal. We think it is a step in the right direction. We think that the Convention unequivocally made a step in the right direction as far as satisfactory progress is concerned. We urge your support.

John P. Reardon Jr. (Harvard University): On behalf of the Council, I rise to oppose the adoption of Proposal 54. The legislation seems somewhat unclear to me, and it rejects more than is necessary the ability of the student to have any kind of flexible program to come and go from college and still play sports. More importantly, the student who must withdraw from college against his or her will is going to have a tough time on returning to college, catching up on enough credits to be able to continue playing in a sport. This proposed legislation provides one more discriminatory wall separating the athlete from the rest of the student body, since the athlete can be

prevented from playing his or her sport, even though in good standing in the eyes of his or her institution, at the same time other students with the same academic situation may go ahead and participate in any extracurricular activity.

May I ask what this proposed legislation does better than the continuing-progress legislation currently on the books? There is already more than enough satisfactory-progress legislation. I think that it is fine for Southern California institutionally to make the decision to have a tighter set of restrictions. I think each institution should be able to do this on its own if it wants to but not put it on the backs of everyone. Again, the Council recommends a resounding no vote on this proposal.

John J. Coyle (Pennsylvania State University): Mr. President, I would like to urge your support of Proposal 54. As the first speaker indicated, the completion of 96 credits at the end of four years falls short of the requirements for the degree, and even students in the fifth year often find themselves short of a degree. This proposal will help to overcome that problem. In answer to the preceding speaker from the Council, we have heard a lot of bad publicity about the low number of people graduating from institutions across the country, and this modest proposal will help us to move in the direction of improving our graduation rate. I would urge your support of this proposal.

Jerry Kingston (Arizona State University): I rise in support of Proposition 54. I would like to point out that indeed many degree programs today require more than 120 semester hours; and even in those instances in which they do not, we have current legislation and interpretations, for example, that permit six hours of remedial course work to be taken during the first year at the certifying institution that typically does not count towards a degree. By the way, this legislation is not designed to affect the very strong and academically well-prepared student. This is legislation that is designed to help those students who otherwise may not get a degree, and many of those students often take advantage of some of that remedial work in their first year at the certifying institution. Secondly, it is also the case that many student-athletes, as many other students do, change their majors several times; and by the time they arrive at 96 hours, it is the case that not all of the hours they have taken, in fact, have qualified some for the university degree they ultimately received. Unlike a grade-point average requirement, which was rejected by this group yesterday, this does not require that we develop grading systems or have to change grading systems where they do not now exist. It simply means that we would do for those students most likely not to get a degree something to move them and encourage them in that direction. Thank you very much.

Jerry M. Hughes (Central Missouri State University): Mr. Chair, as a member of the Division II Steering Committee and the Council, I would urge defeat of this proposal for the same reasons that Jack Reardon, the director of athletics at Harvard, mentioned earlier. I

might advise the Division II membership that we are going to have in effect in August of this year a grade-point average that will accompany our 24 hours of credit. I urge Division II—and I think we have adequate academic requirements currently—to defeat this proposal.

Edward H. Hammond (Fort Hays State University): Mr. President, I rise in opposing this particular resolution for two reasons. One is that at our institution, which may not have the same academic qualities as some of you do, approximately 47 percent of the students take four to five years to finish their degrees. I would like to treat all the same. More importantly, if we pass this resolution, I just believe we are forcing student-athletes to go to summer school and we are depriving them of the opportunity to legally make some money that they need in order to pursue their education.

Nicholas D. Constan Jr. (University of Pennsylvania): I am a faculty representative and I teach students. I, too, would like to see them all treated alike. Therefore, I agree with my colleague Jack Reardon in his earlier comments. In addition, however, it would not only force, as the previous speaker said, people to attend summer school, but it might even encourage students to choose easier majors and, therefore, an easier chance of making the required number of credits. I don't think I want to encourage that, either. I would urge you to vote against it.

Michael B. McGee (University of Southern California): I believe this proposal is prostudent-athlete. The passage would narrow the gap by approximately one year of academic credits between eligibility requirements currently in place and the units typically required for a baccalaureate degree.

E. M. Jones (Grambling State University): How does this piece of legislation affect the legislation already on the books as it deals with the banking of hours?

Margaret Gatz (University of Southern California): As the interpretation also points out, this does not affect in any way the banking of hours. What it does is require more hours. So under the current system, if you have to have 48 hours, 48 semester hours after two years and someone passes 26 their first year, they only need to pass 22 the next year. The same principle would apply. You would raise it and expect 51 after two years. If someone passes 26 their first year, they would need only 25 their second year, and so on. So banking is unaffected.

G. Lynn Lashbrook (University of Alaska): On Monday at the National Forum, there were two alarming concerns that came out of the Presidents Commission's study. One is the amount of practice time and, two, the lack of class attendance. I think that passage of this proposal would put pressure on those two variables and send the right message back to strengthen the student-athlete concept. Thank you.

[Proposal No. 54 (Page A-55) was defeated by Divisions I and II.]

Financial Aid Limitation

B. J. Skelton (Clemson University): On behalf of the Council, I move the adoption of Proposal No. 56.

[The motion was seconded.]

In discussions preceding its sponsorship of this legislation, the Council determined that the construction of the current bylaw provisions and the specific actions of the 1987 Convention that moved the basic individual financial aid limitations from the constitution to the bylaws makes it clear that all of the government grants for educational purposes listed in the current provisions of the Bylaw 6-1-(b)-(2) are exempt from counting within the maximum individual limitations of Bylaw 6-1-(a) but remain subject to the general prohibition set forth in Constitution 3-1-(g)-(1) against the award of financial aid in excess of an institution's overall cost of attendance. It is the Council's position that the Convention's actions in 1987 to permit greater divisional autonomy in establishing maximum financial aid limitations was taken with the understanding that the provisions of Constitution 3-1-(g)-(1) continued to govern any division's actions to increase the amount of financial assistance available for student-athletes and that in accordance with the Association's principle of amateurism, the overall maximum amount should not exceed an institution's cost of attendance.

At the same time, however, the Council recognized this interpretation may not be consistent with the practices for awarding financial aid to student-athletes at a significant number of member institutions and that except for the Pell Grant funds, the government grants set forth in Bylaw 6-1-(b)-(2) should not be subject to either of the limitations set forth in the constitution or bylaws. As a result, the Council has chosen to sponsor Proposal No. 56 in an effort to revise NCAA legislation so as to be consistent with the member institutions' actual financial aid practices, where the Pell Grant fund is treated differently from the other governmental programs identified because the Pell Grant monies are awarded for a specific academic year and are intended to meet directly the same basic cost of attendance contemplated in Constitution 3-1-(g)-(1) and Bylaw 6-1-(a), including the value of the tuition, fees, room and board, and books. I would point out that this legislation carries an immediate effective date. Thank you.

[Proposal No. 56 (Page A-57) was approved by all divisions.]

Summer School

Douglas S. Hobbs (University of California, Los Angeles): On behalf of the Council, the Academic Requirements Committee and the Recruiting Committee, I move for the adoption of Proposal No. 57.

[The motion was seconded.]

The purpose of the proposal is to eliminate the current ban on awarding summer school financial aid to entering students. The deeper purpose behind the proposal is to allow student-athletes to start out their academic career on the right foot. I don't think there is anyone who would question the fact that the freshman year is the

most difficult year. It is the year of transition and anxiety, et cetera. It is the belief of all of these sponsoring bodies that by allowing the student-athlete to get his or her academic feet wet in advance, it will make the transition from high school to college clearer and will increase the possibility of graduation.

Charlotte West (Southern Illinois University, Carbondale): I would like to speak in opposition to No. 57. I really do not believe that it will result in improved academic success. I think it will do several other things that are not favorable. One, we speak about treating athletes as all other students whenever it is feasible. No. 57 would, before they get in college, set them aside as something different. I think that all the institutions now have the prerogative to redshirt the freshman athlete for a year, so they have a full year in the summer before they are engaged in competitions. We already allow students five full years of aid and five summers. I don't think one additional summer will make that much difference. What it will do is escalate costs. We continually add costs; and as we add costs to our programs, we really are reducing opportunities for athletes. Additional cost is what results in continuing problems in the sports programs. For those reasons, I speak in opposition to 57.

Marshall M. Criser (University of Florida): We support Proposal 57. Our university, as many universities, require virtually all students who have not demonstrated unequivocally their academic ability to attend summer school the first summer of their freshman year. This is a rule that applies to nonathletes as well as athletes, and the idea is to get them a strong start at the earliest possible time. If ever there is a time to invest in the future, in academic performance for the young man or woman, it is at that first summer.

I believe that this gives that opportunity. To ask students, because they happen to be student-athletes, to come and not have the financial assistance that they are entitled to creates some hardships. We ask your support of this proposal.

Paul J. Olscamp (Bowling Green State University): Speaking for the members of the Mid-American Athletic Conference, I rise to speak against Proposal 57. Although the academic intent of the proposal might be sound, this Convention has for the last three years been in a cost-cutting mode where possible. We believe that this proposal will add materially to the costs of our programs, and we believe that that will be a disadvantage to those schools that might not be able to afford it.

Mr. Hobbs: I would like to respond to the previous speaker. Probably cost will increase temporarily if this proposal is adopted. It is hoped by the sponsors that if this proposal is implemented that costs for summer schools after the first, second and third years will be lessened and that the student who gets off on the right academic foot will not be a perennial denizen of summer sessions. As far as the recruiting advantages are concerned, I would like to call attention to the fact that this proposal has been endorsed by the Recruiting Committee on the grounds of its academic soundness. In addition, the

Recruiting Committee feels that if it is a balancing situation between a recruiting advantage and an academic concern, that the academic concern should take priority. There is nothing wrong with a student's decision to attend Institution A being influenced by the academic treatment that he or she is going to receive at that institution.

Fred Jacoby (Southwest Athletic Conference): I rise to speak in opposition to Proposal No. 57. The intent of the legislation is good. However, there is another side to the coin. When listening to the academic reasons for adjustment, you can be blinded to the disadvantages. The reasons for opposing this legislation are the following:

1. It will be a tremendous increase in the budget of each institution when considering all sports for men and women. This legislation has a definite impact on increasing your budgets significantly.

2. One can argue that it is permissive legislation. That simply is not true from a practical sense. When one institution does it, their opponent will have to do it to be competitive in recruiting.

3. Attending summer session for freshmen will increase the opportunities for captive practices, which will be organized and will be self-defeating to the arguments for the academic-transition period between high school and college work.

4. The freshman student will lose the opportunity for summer earnings in his home community and place a greater burden on the coaching staff to secure summer jobs at the university. A summer job and summer practices, combined with summer school work, will be defeating the very purpose of this legislation as it overburdens the student for doing a good job academically.

5. Lastly, at major Division I-A football programs, a large portion of the freshmen recruits are redshirted, as many as 80 percent, which takes off the pressure for competition from the freshman year allowing for an easier adjustment in the college academically that first year.

In addition to all of the above valid reasons for defeating Proposal No. 57, a graduating senior from high school needs that last summer to be home with his or her parents to plan and think through the career objectives and goals in the next chapter of adult life. I urge you to look at both sides of the coin of this proposal and remind you that the disadvantages far outweigh the advantages. I urge you to defeat the proposal.

Donna A. Lopiano (University of Texas, Austin): I would urge defeat of this proposal. No one would argue against a head-start summer school program for academic-risk students. This proposal does not address academic-risk students. It needs more work and should be brought back with that concept in mind.

John W. Sawyer (Wake Forest University): One quick point relative to policy. A previous speaker has said that right now we can give five years or five summers of aid and this would add another summer. That is not true. What we will be doing is taking the fifth summer and putting it in at the beginning of the first year, because your five-year clock starts at the beginning of the first summer and

runs out at the end of the fifth academic year. You would not be able to give the fifth summer thereafter.

Roy V. Kramer (Vanderbilt University): I am always amazed at this Convention. We stand and argue all types of satisfactory progress, grade-point averages and everything about the graduation rates and success academically; and we get a piece of legislation that would require us to raise the down payment and lower the payment at the end of one's career and give a person a chance to succeed academically far more than we do now, and we all run up the red flag. In due respect, for once we ought to think about the student-athlete and his success as a student. There is no question—it has been proved time and time again—if we give them a slight head start, we will benefit. If we have some risks involved, we ought to take those risks for once and make it possible for these people to graduate.

[Proposal No. 57 (Page A-57) was defeated. Part B moot due to defeat of part A.]

[The meeting was recessed at 12:15 p.m.]

Wednesday Afternoon, January 11, 1989

The meeting was called to order at 1:30 p.m., with President Bailey presiding.

Financial Aid—Nongraduates

Nicholas L. White (Memphis State University): On behalf of the Metropolitan Collegiate Athletic Conference, I move the adoption of Proposal No. 58.

[The motion was seconded.]

This proposal will permit universities to provide additional educational assistance and opportunities for student-athletes who initially entered college prior to 1986 and who have not yet completed their degree requirements. Under the current legislation, we are limited to five years of financial aid within a six-year period. This proposed amendment simply will permit additional aid under very specific guidelines and conditions to enable these former student-athletes to complete their undergraduate degrees.

I would like to emphasize that this cannot be used as a recruiting tool because of the 1986 deadline. Clearly, no competitive advantage is obtained for the recipients, who under this proposal previously would have exhausted all of their eligibility. It is permissive legislation. An institution with high graduation rates in the past probably has no need for this, except in isolated cases. But even at that situation, there may be a deserving former student-athlete who could be assisted. This amendment will provide us and similarly situated institutions with an opportunity to assist former student-athletes who warrant a second chance. The NCAA currently operates a similar financial aid program for the student-athletes who have completed their undergraduate degrees. The Association helps some and we want to be able to help even more of these former student-athletes. As a result, this proposal is in the spirit of the NCAA assisting its early former student-athletes. I urge your support of this measure as one additional step this membership can take in assisting our student-athletes. Thank you.

Elwood N. Shields (Bentley College): Mr. Chair, I am a member of the Council and the Division II Steering Committee. The Council and the Division II Steering Committee have voted to oppose this legislation. Current NCAA rules permit an institution to provide up to five years of financial assistance to a student-athlete to complete his or her undergraduate degree. It is our concern that this legislation would reduce and not enhance the incentive for the student-athlete to continue to move forward so that the degree could be completed within the time period for which financial assistance currently is permitted.

A coach or administrator who is not primarily interested in the welfare of the student might direct him or her into courses that would permit the retaining of eligibility but would not keep the student on pace to complete a degree in a timely fashion. Further, adoption of this legislation could place an additional financial burden on member

institutions. As you are aware, the prior speaker said, the NCAA has established a national program to assist undergraduate students in completing their degrees. The steering committee and the Council continue to support efforts to assist student-athletes in completing their degree requirements. It is our position that this type of proposal may be counter-productive to that effort. We urge that you vote against this proposal.

Susan A. Collins (George Mason University): On behalf of the Council, I rise in opposition to Proposition 58. Although the Council is sensitive to some student-athletes' need for additional time to complete their degree programs due to, for example, change of major or because they discontinued their education, we feel that the current policy of allowing five years of aid reflects the membership's position of encouraging student-athletes to graduate within the five years. To extend the opportunity for an additional five years of aid would not present these student-athletes with the proper incentive to obtain their degree in a timely manner. We urge the defeat of this proposal.

James I. Robertson Jr. (Virginia Polytechnic Institute): I would like to speak in favor of the proposed amendment. Many remarks made during this Convention, including those of Executive Director Schultz, emphasized that the primary goal of this organization is the education of the student-athletes. Proposition 58 will make them meet satisfactory progress. This change in the constitution is permissive legislation that will enable the membership to provide financial aid under specific guidelines to those former student-athletes who enrolled prior to the fall term of 1986 and who have not yet completed their undergraduate degree requirements. No. 58 stipulates that these students must meet the initial requirements and must assume the course of study that meets the institution's undergraduate-degree requirements in a specified area of study. Please note that this would facilitate attendance by the student who may only be able to attend on a part-time basis. This no doubt applies to the majority of these students since many now have family responsibilities. I will repeat the reason for the specific enrollment in the fall of 1986 is to take any recruiting advantage out of the process. The date also was inserted to alleviate the concerns that we would be moving to a 10-year scholarship program. Lately, academic programs by student-athletes in our institutions indicate that the current five-year limitation should offer adequate opportunities for graduation to those student-athletes who apply themselves. We respectfully request your support of this amendment.

[Proposal No. 58 (Page A-60) was defeated.]

Employment—Exhausted Eligibility

Burt L. Monroe Jr. (University of Louisville): On behalf of the Metropolitan Collegiate Athletic Conference, I move the adoption of Proposal No. 59.

[The motion was seconded.]

This proposal would exempt term time and employment earnings

from counting against the student-athlete's Bylaw 6-1-(a) limitation. The student-athlete would exhaust eligibility in a particular sport during the previous academic year and subsequently does not practice or compete in intercollegiate athletics. Thus, a fifth-year, full-scholarship student-athlete, who completed his or her eligibility during the previous academic year, could gain valuable career experience and earn additional funds without having their scholarship negated as required under Bylaw 6-1-(a). I believe this body should encourage such postathletics career efforts and opportunities involving student-athletes. Please note that all other employment safeguards of current legislation remain in effect, such as the total cap on cost of attendance. These include the requirements that the work actually be performed in compensation formally billed at the going rate. I urge your support of this proposal that would permit some student-athletes to take advantage of employment opportunities to improve their own economic condition. I may also add, if my information is correct, the Council did not oppose this one.

Ralph McFillen (Metropolitan Collegiate Athletic Conference): I rise in support of Proposal No. 59. I want to emphasize that this legislation deals with only the fifth- or sixth-year student-athlete who has exhausted eligibility and does not practice and does not play. We had two situations in our conference this past year where the student-athletes were caught in a situation in which they had the opportunity for a job to earn additional money, were married and needed the funds, but were unable to do so because their financial aid was in place. This legislation aids the average student-athlete who does not qualify for the need-base aid but has additional expenses not covered by an athletics scholarship. Keep in mind that the student-athletes are limited to the cost of attendance, and it is not a recruiting advantage. It is no cost to the institution and it helps the student-athlete. In a limited number of situations, I think this would be in the best interest of the individuals and the Association. We urge your support of Proposal 59.

[Proposal No. 59 (Page A-61) was approved by all divisions.]

Resolution: Revision of NCAA Manual

David Price (Pacific-10 Conference): On behalf of the Council and the Special Committee on Deregulation and Rules Simplification, I move the adoption of Proposal No. 69.

[The motion was seconded.]

Our committee has spent the last three and one-half years revising, reorganizing, rewriting and clarifying the NCAA Manual. These efforts were detailed in The NCAA News and at the three division sessions yesterday. Executive Director Schultz gave this project a ringing endorsement in his "State of the Association" remarks on Sunday. The committee is confident that the proposed Manual significantly improves the current Manual. Mr. President, I consider it an honor to be able to introduce Proposal 69; but in all candor, I was asked to do so only because the chair of the committee was otherwise

occupied. It is you that deserves the credit for this project and the membership is indebted to you and your leadership. (Applause)
President Bailey: Thank you. Thank you for your candor, Mr. Price. (Laughter)

[Proposal No. 69 (Page A-68) was approved.]

Resolution: Interpretation of Revised NCAA Manual

Donna A. Lopiano (University of Texas, Austin): On behalf of the sponsors, I move the adoption of Proposal No. 70.

[The motion was seconded.]

As was explained in the business sessions yesterday at the division levels, it was stated that this proposal would allow us to correct inadvertently made errors in the revised Manual. As I say, this provides the mechanics for the Council to rectify those mistakes during the coming year. We urge your adoption of this proposal.

[Proposal No. 70 (Page A-68) was approved.]

Faculty Athletics Representative

David H. Bennett (Syracuse University): Mr. Chair, I move adoption of Proposal No. 71.

[The motion was seconded.]

Bonnie Slatton (University of Iowa): I would move the adoption of Proposal No. 71-1.

[The motion was seconded.]

What this amendment does simply is remove the second sentence in Proposal 71. Although most of us who serve as faculty representatives do certify the eligibility of athletes by signing conference and NCAA forms, there seems to be a great deal of confusion in the wording of this amendment as to what being responsible for that certification means, whether or not it means being involved in the process by going through all of the student records and then certifying or if it simply means working with the registrar and the admissions officers. Because of that confusion, we would like to delete that sentence so we can get to the main part of the motion, which is to specify who the faculty representatives should be. I urge the support of the amendment.

John A. Hogan (Colorado Schools of Mines): On Saturday, the Faculty Athletics Representatives Association, at its forum, overwhelmingly voted to support Amendment No. 71. There were approximately 150 people present. There were three "no" votes for 71 in its original form. However, we do recognize that there is a genuine concern about the ambiguity of two words in sentence three: "sponsor and certifying." In the interest of avoiding divisiveness and promoting harmony, as outgoing chair of the Faculty Athletics Representatives Association, I urge the faculty representatives and other members present today to support the amendment to No. 71.

[Proposal No. 71-1 (Page A-69) was approved.]

Robert R. Peck (Williams College): I rise to oppose this legislation for the following reasons: It seems to me that this legislation is designed to discriminate against those faculty members whose

faculty responsibilities include responsibilities in the area of intercollegiate athletics. Persons with faculty rank and faculty responsibilities should not be discriminated against because of their discipline and departmental responsibilities. It is ironic to me that in the section of the country where I reside, namely New England, it is very common for faculty members in the departments of physical education and athletics to hold the position of faculty representatives. It is ironic because these same institutions, primarily in Division III, seem to have exercised very reasonable and prudent judgment in keeping the programs of athletics in harmony with institutional goals. In those divisions and institutions where a member of the athletics department rarely, if ever, holds the position of faculty representative, the record is certainly not any better, if as good, as the institutions that I speak about in keeping their athletics policies in harmony with institutional goals. So, why prohibit this probably small but effective group of athletics administrators from continuing to exercise their responsibilities as faculty representatives? It seems wrong and discriminatory to pass such legislation that effectively would eliminate that segment of our faculty athletics representatives who have a very sound record of representing the basic educational philosophies of their institutions. I urge the defeat of this discriminatory and unnecessary legislation.

James A. Castaneda (Rice University): I rise to speak in opposition to Proposal No. 71, as amended. It would seem that the intent of this legislative proposal is to prevent the appointment as a faculty representative of a person who in reality is primarily a coach or an administrator in a department of athletics. An unavoidable effect of this legislation would also prevent service to an institution as faculty representative by a person who is primarily a faculty member but who additionally has an opportunity to involve himself or herself in athletics.

Throughout my 31-year career at two institutions, I have served as both professor and coach. In each case, I was hired to teach foreign language and subsequently was afforded the opportunity to coach. My coach in college was also my professor of Latin, and he inspired me to devote my life to an effort, both in the classroom and on the athletics field, to attain the worthy goal of a sound mind and a sound body. It has been noted that someone in my position could be protected by the grandfather clause in this proposed legislation. I respectfully submit that individual protection from unnecessary and imperfect legislation is not very satisfactory. At a time when cooperation and solidarity are so important, if we ever hope to build and maintain truly healthy programs of intercollegiate athletics, I find this legislation to be distasteful in that it postulates an adversarial scenario in which coaches and athletics administrators as a class are assumed not to share a faculty member's interest in high academic standards.

I do not accept such type casting. In my projected best-of-athletics worlds, I would like to see more faculty colleagues involved on both ends of the academic and athletics spectrum rather than foster

through legislation such as Proposition 71 the formal division and separation of functions, which in the long run, in my opinion, will do more to alienate us one from another than to unite us. We all would agree, I hope, that the appointment as a faculty representative of someone who is not legitimately and primarily a member of the faculty is in obvious violation to both the spirit and the letter of NCAA legislation. If such violations and abuses occur, we should work diligently to stop them. But let's not be negative. Let's work toward positive goals and let's foster faith and cooperation rather than distrust and adversarial relationships. For the philosophical reason stated, I urge defeat of this proposition.

John A. Hogan (Colorado School of Mines): As outgoing chair of the Faculty Representatives Association, I would like to comment on four topics concerning the amendment. Number one, why does the amendment specify that the faculty rep should be a member of the teaching faculty or of faculty rank? Because, the faculty representative represents the academic constituency in the triad of campus constituencies, the triad of education, administration and academics. The faculty athletics representative is the institutional link between the classroom and the playing field. The faculty rep demonstrates the faculty's belief that the intellectual development of students is the primary mission of an institution of higher learning and that the value of extracurricular activities, athletics included, shall be measured by their contributions to that mission, that each institution shall hold as its highest priority the protection of academic integrity.

Point two, why does the amendment ask for the separation of the faculty representative from the athletics department? By the way, there is no requirement that a member of the physical education faculty may not serve as faculty rep. In the summer of 1987, in Dallas, Texas, at the special Convention the faculty reps were fortunate to have newly appointed Executive Director Dick Schultz speak to our group of faculty reps. One of the main points that Executive Director Schultz made to our faculty reps was that you must be independent of the athletics department. He expressed that point very specifically. "Certainly, you are not going to be adversaries with the athletics department," he said. "However, you must remain separate from the athletics department." The only way that we can have an appropriate system of checks and balances is for the person who represents the faculty to be separated from the athletics department.

Point three, the requirements that we set forth in Proposal 71 need to be set formally in the Manual. There is no place where an institution can refer in the Manual and see the faculty rep requirements. Walter Byers spoke to our faculty reps group in San Diego and said that you need to be in the Manual and be recognized formally so you can get on with your contribution to academic integrity in the NCAA.

Point four, if you will look at the amendment, you will note that it has a grandfather clause; no institution is asked to change its present

faculty representative arrangement. If you will look at the intent statement in the second clause, it says to specify that the faculty athletics representatives subsequently designated after this legislation becomes effective. What that means by the framers is that only a newly appointed rep would have to meet these requirements. Any continuing appointments would be able to go on as they are now.

Finally, as I said, on Saturday the vote was approximately 140-3 among faculty representatives to support 71. In the spirit of keeping with what was said Monday by Chancellor Reed of Florida and Dick Schultz about the fact that education is our primary objective, we ask for your support in passing Proposal No. 71. Thank you.

George Andrews (Oberlin College): Last Saturday at the faculty representatives' forum, as John Hogan already has reported, there was overwhelming support on the part of the athletics representatives of Proposition No. 71. Yesterday at the Division III business session, there was an agenda item entitled How Does A Member Get Involved In The NCAA Governance Structure? In the course of the presentation, there was a clear call from our leadership for us as individuals to become involved in the NCAA governance structure through committee work, to broaden the participation, if you will. At this point, we have an opportunity to further encourage that broad participation through the appointment of faculty athletics representatives as is proposed in 71. Perhaps the biggest opportunity we have before us in this legislation is the chance to make a statement responsive to the academic-integrity concerns so frequently expressed in the context of athletics these days, a provision for more academic conscience, if you will. I urge you to support Proposition No. 71.

Stanley Clark (California State University, Hayward): Mr. President, I am a little bit confused. The chair of the Faculty Athletics Representatives Association mentioned that this legislation does not prohibit a member of a physical education department from serving in this capacity. However, at my institution we do not have a separate athletics department, we have an athletics program housed within the department of physiology and physical education. Our director of education is a member of the physical ed department and holds faculty rank. So I believe that this situation I am describing also may be germane to a number of Division III institutions; and I think it is creating some confusion and it is inconsistent with the intent of this legislation. Thank you.

[Proposal No. 71 (Page A-69) was approved as amended by No. 71-1.]

Off-Season Drug Testing

Fred Jacoby (Southwest Athletic Conference): Mr. President, I move the adoption of Proposal No. 74.

[The motion was seconded.]

The purpose of this legislation is to provide flexibility in sports other than football for an NCAA off-season drug-testing program. There would be no increase in cost, since the maximum of 25 students

would be tested. It is our belief that we have much to learn in the area of drug testing. Flexibility to test students in sports other than football will provide a more meaningful program. Thus, I urge you to vote in favor of Proposal No. 74.

[Proposal No. 74 (Page A-71) was approved by all divisions.]

Legislative Review Committee

John P. Reardon Jr. (Harvard University): Mr. President, I move adoption on behalf of the Council of Proposal No. 76.

[The motion was seconded.]

Last fall, I served as chair of the Council Subcommittee on the Incorporation of Interpretations and Legislation in the NCAA Manual. That committee believes that since the deregulation committee has completed its work, which provided us with a revised Manual, it is logical to carry on the work started by that committee by establishing a committee that would have an oversight responsibility for maintenance of the revised Manual and, No. 2, incorporating new legislation and interpretations in the Manual. Also, it would review the deregulations issues. This proposal would establish such a committee. It is my belief that the establishment of the Legislative Review Committee will assist the Association further in defining the interpretative process. I urge the adoption of this proposal.

[Proposal No. 76 (Page A-72) was approved by all divisions.]

Student-Athlete Advisory Committee

Cecil W. Ingram (Florida State University): On behalf of the Council, I move adoption of Proposal No. 77.

[The motion was seconded.]

This proposal would establish the Student-Athlete Advisory Committee. The committee would receive information and explanations of the Association's activities in legislation and review and react to topics referred to it by other NCAA committees and the Council. The committee would function in an advisory capacity and would serve as an important resource to the Association in obtaining input from student-athletes on the appropriate issues. I urge the adoption of this legislation.

Della Durant (Pennsylvania State University): I also speak on behalf of the Council on Proposal No. 77. The formation of a Student-Athlete Advisory Committee greatly facilitates and enhances student-athletes' opportunity for input on relevant issues important to them and the athletics and academic functions of the Association. I also urge your support of this very important proposal.

[Proposal No. 77 (Page A-73) was approved by all divisions.]

Baseball Rules and Division Baseball Committees

Eugene F. Corrigan (Atlantic Coast Conference): Mr. President, I move the adoption of Proposal No. 78.

[The motion was seconded.]

The NCAA Executive Committee proposes this legislation with the intent of establishing a separate rules-making committee and separate sports committees for the administration of the three

baseball championships. There currently are 12 committee members and one secretary-rules editor responsible for the administration of the three championships and the rules of the sport. For example, the six-man Division I subcommittee is responsible for the selection of 48 teams to the Division I tournament, the administration of eight regional tournaments and the conduct of the College World Series. It should be noted that the Division I championship generated more than \$2 million in gross receipts in 1988 and more than 130,000 fans attended the College World Series in Omaha. For the Divisions II and III championships, three-man subcommittees have these same championship responsibilities. These 12 representatives also serve as the rules-making body for the sport. It increasingly is becoming apparent that the sport of baseball has advanced to a stage where more committee representation is needed to administer effectively and efficiently the championships and develop the rules. The Executive Committee supports adoption of this proposal and I urge your support.

[Proposal No. 78 (Page A-73) was approved by all divisions.]

Ice Hockey Rules and Divisions I and III Ice Hockey Committees

Eugene F. Corrigan (Atlantic Coast Conference): I move the adoption of Proposal No. 79.

[The motion was seconded.]

As was the case with Proposal No. 78, the Executive Committee proposed this legislation with the intent of establishing a separate rules-making committee and two committees for the administration of the two ice hockey championships. For many of the same reasons, the Executive Committee is of the opinion that the sport of ice hockey is deserving of more committee representation to effectively administer the championships and to develop the rules of the sport. The Executive Committee supports the adoption of this proposal and I urge your support.

[Proposal No. 79 (Page A-75) was approved by all divisions.]

Men's and Women's Soccer Rules Committee

Eugene F. Corrigan (Atlantic Coast Conference): Mr. President, I move the adoption of Proposal No. 80.

[The motion was seconded.]

This proposal is similar to the two preceding proposals. However, it differs in that its adoption would establish a joint Men's and Women's Soccer Rules Committee while retaining separate Men's and Women's Soccer Committees for championships administration. At present, the Women's Soccer Committee has no rules-making responsibilities and those championships are conducted under international rules, while the Men's Soccer Committee is responsible for developing playing rules for soccer. This has created a great deal of confusion, especially for officials who work both men's and women's soccer competition.

This proposal will eliminate these problems and bring uniformity to the manner in which men's and women's soccer is played on the intercollegiate level. The Men's and Women's Soccer Committees and

the Executive Committee support this proposal. Just for your information, the cost of this to the Association would be about the same as taking your conference to lunch at Four Seasons.

[Proposal No. 80 (Page A-77) was approved by all divisions.]

Prospective Student-Athlete

Robert R. Snell (Kansas State University): Mr. Chair, on behalf of the Council, I move adoption of Proposal No. 82.

[The motion was seconded.]

This proposal attempts to create a more consistent definition of the phrase "prospective student-athlete." Currently, the tryout rule defines the prospective student-athlete as an individual who has started classes for the ninth grade or has had his or her 15th birthday. However, no such definition exists with respect to Bylaw 1-1(b)-(3), and Bylaw 1-2. Thus, these provisions apply to prospects currently from present grade. This proposal specifies that prior to the commencement of the classes for the ninth grade Association recruiting rules do not affect the individual directly. However, during that time, a member institution may not provide such an individual or the individual's relatives or friends any financial aid or other benefits that the institution does not provide to prospective students generally. Subsequent to the individual's commencement of the ninth grade, the Association's recruiting rules will govern the institution's relationship to the individual. I urge the adoption of this legislation.

[Proposal No. 82 (Page A-79) was approved by all divisions.]

Contact Restrictions

Bill Menefee (Baylor University): I move adoption of Proposal No. 83.

[The motion was seconded.]

This proposal would amend the contact restrictions that applies to prospective student-athletes on days of their competition to prohibit any contact with the prospective student-athlete prior to any athletics competition in which the prospective student-athlete is a participant regardless of the site of the competition.

[Proposal No. 83 (Page A-80) was approved by all divisions.]

Summer Sports Camps and Summer Clinics

Ann Marie Lawler (University of Florida): Mr. Chair, I move adoption of Proposal No. 85.

[The motion was seconded.]

Robert F. Stidel Jr. (University of California, Berkeley): Mr. Chair, I move the adoption of Proposal No. 85-1.

[The motion was seconded.]

Mr. Chair, amendment-to-amendment No. 85-1 would confine institutional sports camps in football and basketball to the summer vacation period, which will allow institutional camps and clinics in sports other than football and basketball to be held at other times during the year. Both football and basketball have recruiting calendars and sports other than football and basketball do not. No. 85-1 would allow the use of sports camps and clinics as a subtle way

of avoiding the recruiting calendar. But since that is not a problem with other sports, and since the development of these camps in these sports is needed, there is no need to treat them the same as the camps in football and basketball. It is proper that we do so for football and basketball but not in the sports other than football and basketball. No. 85—1 would remove that problem and make 85 more acceptable.

[Proposal No. 85—1 (Page A-84) was approved by all divisions.]
[Proposal No. 85 (Page A-81) was approved by Divisions II (89-60) and III (107-103) and defeated by Division I (89-168), as amended by No. 85—1.]

Tryouts—Developmental Clinics

Robert R. Snell (Kansas State University): Mr. President, on behalf of the Council, I move the adoption of Proposal No. 86.

[The motion was seconded.]

This proposal further clarifies the Association's tryout rule, Bylaw 1-6, by specifying that the clinic participants shall not receive recruiting presentations and by requiring the participant to be a resident of the state in which the host institution is located or live within 100 miles of the host institution. The Recruiting Committee has reviewed this issue on numerous occasions and has concluded that these restrictions will insure a more competitive balance. I urge your support.

[Proposal No. 86 (Page A-86) was approved by all divisions.]

Recruiting Contacts—National Letter of Intent Nonsubscribers

Jeffrey H. Orleans (Council of Ivy Group Presidents): Mr. Chair, on behalf of the Ivy League, I move adoption of Proposal No. 94.

[The motion was seconded.]

Mr. Chair, this proposal would permit institutions, which do not subscribe to the National Letter of Intent program but provide in their regular-admissions process for the kind of quiet period that the National Letter of Intent program embodies, to refrain from observing the National Letter of Intent quiet period while continuing to abide by their own quiet period. In essence, it would say those institutions that are nonletter institutions, but do have a quiet period, could use their own quiet period rather than the letter's quiet period.

Roy V. Kramer (Vanderbilt University): I believe it is inappropriate to exclude anyone from that quiet period. We are all recruiting and we should all play by the same rules while recruiting, regardless of what the reason may be. We certainly should not exempt anyone from the quiet period immediately prior to the National Letter of Intent. I would urge you to defeat this proposal.

Mr. Orleans: I would note that while we all are recruiting, as Roy says, not all of us subscribe to the National Letter of Intent program. It is a voluntary program. It is not a part of the NCAA constitution or bylaws. It is not enacted by the NCAA membership. It is a voluntary program. Certainly, those that are subscribers to it should abide by the rules. Those that choose not to be subscribers to it should not be bound by an NCAA voting decision that they must, nonetheless, abide

by the rules. It seems to be inconsistent with the principle of institutions being able to choose their own paths.

Carla H. Hay (Marquette University): The quiet period is not just for the institutions but for students, who are subject to recruitment pressure constantly. People can choose not to abide by the recruiting period that most of us abide by, but the student ought to have some time not to be under pressure.

[Proposal No. 94 (Page A-91) was defeated by Divisions I and II.]

Football Evaluation Periods

Frank Windegger (Texas Christian University): I move the adoption of Proposal No. 98.

[The motion was seconded.]

I urge your support of this proposition for several reasons: One, more than 80 percent of the high school games are played on Friday night in the United States. Two, it has been traditional for college coaches to view high school games in the month of October and it does not add much cost to the budget. Three, and most importantly, I think that for the people in the northern tier of the country the high school season is over at the end of October or the start of November; so they do not have much of a chance to evaluate those high school students.

Frederick E. Gruninger (Rutgers University, New Brunswick): Mr. Chair, this legislation adjusts the evaluation periods to meet a specific sport's need. This proposal does not meet the broad need and it is my understanding that it extends the evaluation period. Thus, on behalf of the NCAA Council, I wish to indicate our opposition to this proposal simply because it extends the evaluation period. I suggest that the proposer come back next year to the Convention as other sports have and adjust their evaluation period.

L. Oval Jaynes (Colorado State University): I would like to add to what Frank Windegger has said and also our good friend from Rutgers University. It is important for us to evaluate our student-athletes; and for those people that live in areas of the country where their football seasons are over by late October, very few young men have an opportunity to be evaluated. It creates a tremendous hardship on those schools that are recruiting athletes in those sections of the country. I would ask that you support Proposition 98.

[Proposal No. 98 (Page A-93) was approved by Division I, 61-52, and defeated by Division II, 38-50. See Page A-93 for subsequent voting action.]

Self-Financed Visits—Institutional Facilities

Ann Marie Lawler (University of Florida): I move adoption of Proposal No. 102.

[The motion was seconded.]

This proposal will confirm that a member institution is permitted to transport a prospective student-athlete during a self-financed visit to view off-campus practice and competition sites at other institutional facilities located within a 30-mile radius of the institution's campus.

The Council and members of the NCAA Recruiting Committee support this proposal, because it will provide prospective student-athletes on their unofficial visits an opportunity to view off-campus athletic facilities as well as off-campus academic facilities within a 30-mile radius.

[Proposal No. 102 (Page A-95) was approved by all divisions.]

Official Visit—Transportation

Donald C. Landry (Southland Conference): I move the adoption of Proposal No. 103.

[The motion was seconded.]

In the recruiting of football prospects, most schools have recruiting weekends when large numbers of prospective student-athletes make the official visits to their campus. Currently, anyone on the athletics staff may pick up the prospects at the bus, train station or the major airport nearest the campus. However, only full-time coaches are allowed to pick up the prospects at their school or at their home. Especially in I-AA, this creates a severe hardship because of smaller staffs of full-time coaches. We are asking for a little relief and that only for official visits so that any prospect may be picked up and transported to the campus for their official visit by any member of the athletics staff.

There are currently cases where we can go to the nearest airport and bring the prospect in; and yet across the street, we could not pick up another prospect. Some people have argued that you are putting some coaches on the road—part-time coaches—that maybe don't know the recruiting rules quite as well. We already are allowing them to go to the train station or the airport. We encourage you to support this amendment.

Cecil W. Ingram (Florida State University): I have to say on behalf of the Council that I urge your defeat of this proposal. As the presenter mentioned, this would allow more than the full-time assistants and head coach off the campus to recruit. We currently have legislation that allows other personnel to operate within a 30-mile radius. We feel that we have a danger here in that people not authorized to recruit could go off-campus.

[Proposal No. 103 (Page A-95) was defeated by all divisions.]

Reconsideration of Football Evaluation Periods

Harley W. Lewis (University of Montana): Mr. President, we were on the prevailing side of Proposal No. 98, and we would like to have that reconsidered. It is our belief that all Division I recruits should have the same time.

[The motion was seconded.]

[Proposal No. 98 (Page A-93) was approved by Division I-AA after a motion to reconsider was approved. See Page A-93 for subsequent voting action.]

Individual-Team Championships

Noel W. Olsen (North Central Intercollegiate Athletic Conference): Mr. Chair, I move the adoption of Proposal No. 105.

[The motion was seconded.]

I would urge support from all three divisions for the following reasons: There are occasions when individual athletes in Divisions II and III rise above their level to world class status. They should have a chance to compete with the best in the NCAA as well as in international competition. Since recruiting is very difficult in nonrevenue sports in Divisions II and III, we believe this would help encourage somebody to come to our schools in Divisions II and III. Division II has lost wrestling schools recently to Division I because of the current status of this legislation. I believe that a change back to the previous status would help keep some of our schools in Division II. It is my opinion that there will be some Division II people or a few people who will oppose this. For financial reasons, I remind them, they certainly do not have to advance. Please help keep our athletics programs healthy.

Edward S. Steitz (Springfield College): Mr. President, I speak in support of the proposition to give Divisions II and III athletes the opportunity to compete in the Division I championships. This is meaningful especially as it concerns Olympic competition. My institution's gold medalist, Jeff Lappin, who won the heavyweight wrestling championship in the Los Angeles Games in 1984, indicated without any equivocation that being able to compete in the Division I wrestling championships after he had won the Division II national championship, was significantly instrumental and influential in his making the Olympic team and in turn winning the gold medal. Winning gold medals does, indeed, enhance the image of the entire NCAA membership. We witnessed that very fact at the honors luncheon on Monday and last night at the awards dinner. I point out as the previous speaker just did that this is permissible legislation. If you do not want to send your athlete to the higher-level competition, that is your privilege. However, please do not restrict us from the opportunity to send our athletes to the next level. I strongly urge the support of this amendment.

Edward E. Bozik (University of Pittsburgh): As the chair of the Division I Championships Committee and a member of the Executive Committee, I have been asked to speak against the adoption of Proposal No. 105. Personally, I do this with mixed emotions, given that the current NCAA heavyweight wrestling champion is a student-athlete on our own campus at the University of Pittsburgh, Johnstown. He demonstrated his athletics excellence through competition in the Division I Wrestling Championships. Making up my mind how to vote on this issue, therefore, has not been an easy, personal decision. For many of the same reasons, it has not been an easy decision for the Executive Committee or members of the Council or members-at-large at the past Conventions.

The result has been an inconsistency in our rules dating back to the early 1970s when we had only college and university divisions. But these distinctions brought competition to the legislative purposes. However, the establishment of separate legislative and competitive

divisions has led us over the years to a position of greater autonomy within the divisions under the umbrella of federation. This issue, therefore, reflects and mirrors the kind of divisions that occur as a result of that federation process.

The Executive Committee, which represents you in all three divisions, has examined carefully the pros and cons of advancement. We have decided strictly against Proposal No. 105 for the following reasons. Each division competes based on a philosophy derived by its own members. Those philosophies are in practice. Thus, we have separate and distinct championships for individuals and teams in each division. Second, it diminishes and demeans the value of divisional championships when individuals are permitted to move from one division and compete at another division's championships. Three, we do not permit teams to compete at different levels of competition. Why then should individuals be permitted? Four, we restrict very severely in-season competition across division membership lines. It is logically consistent to carry through with the same restriction at the championships level. Five, we restrict Division I members in competing in Division II championships and we restrict further Divisions I and II members from competing at Division III championships.

You will note that not once in this whole discussion did I use the term "advancement." We have all fallen victim of these satisfactory semantic traps. A champion within his or her own division is a champion. Let us not diminish the value of that championship. Thank you, Mr. President.

James Fallis (Lake Superior State University): Mr. President, I think a couple of things have to be known by our membership. Number one, two years ago when this was brought up, there was support from the sports committees. Since that time, and after a closer view, a number of sports committees, including the sports committees for wrestling and swimming, now support this proposal. One other thing is that I do believe that the Division I student-athletes in the individual sports want to compete against the best regardless of divisions. As was so eloquently mentioned, Carlton Haselrig, Division II national champion and Division I national heavyweight wrestling champion, would not be if he had entered the university two years ago. I think the Division I wrestlers would feel a little bit empty if they had not had a chance to compete against Carlton Haselrig.

Number three, we have a number of states that do not have Division I institutions in their state. You are creating a situation for student-athletes where they have to make some hard choices. They are going to have to leave their home state in order to compete at an institution that has that particular sport. We talk about restriction of cross competition during the season, and I would like to bring to Mr. Bozik's attention that Division II and Division I compete together continuously throughout the season in the sports of swimming and wrestling.

The executive director, in the last year and one-half, has mentioned feverishly that we must do what we can to make Division II and Division III attractive. This proposal is a move in that direction. Academically, Division II has moved to an equality with Division I. Division II has a more stringent satisfactory-progress rule than Division I. I urge your adoption. A vote for 105 is a vote for student-athletes in individual sports.

Samuel J. Freas (Kenyon College): Mr. President, Kenyon College has had a fine individual-sport tradition in its history having attracted an Olympic medal winner, a tennis player who won the collegiate champion of USA-France, and more recently, a swimmer who did very well in Division I swimming. Prior to matriculating at Kenyon College, they would be considered average at best. Something unique happened in the whole educational experience. They became self-conceptualized, and they started exploring their potential in athletics.

I also serve as the executive director of the College Football Coaches of America. The current president, Greg Lockhart, of Montclair State University in New Jersey, directed a study of the impact on the Divisions II and III athletes in the sport of swimming in the men's and women's championships. In the last 10 years, three top-10 teams have been displaced due to Division II and Division III athletes. Ironically, I was a coach of one of those teams displaced. I supported small college participation then and I do now for the following reasons. Many Olympic Festivals, Goodwill Games and World University Games, are selected by participation in Division I championships. It is my understanding that several federations, including United States swimming, will not recognize Division II and Division III championships as a method for these coveted team selections. With a 21-week and 26-week restriction, it really does not allow these athletes to compete for these teams.

Finally, and probably most importantly, without the Division II and Division III athletes competing in the collegiate Division I championship, you lose the wonderful message, a message that resources and finances don't always determine the person's outcome; but the will to win and achieve overcomes just about everything. Let's allow the Jim Thorp stories, the Jeff Black stories and the Edwin Moses stories to be heard by this Association and allow this Association to be the mechanism that does support this effort. Thank you.

Anthony DeCarlo (John Carroll University): I, too, would like to speak in support of 105. Yesterday I appealed to the Division III colleagues. Two years ago, in San Diego, I was not afforded the opportunity to speak in support of this particular proposal, because the question was called prior to my comments. I would like to state that I agree with all of the comments that have come forward in support of this, but I also would like to add that two years ago many Division III and Division I and Division II people felt that there was a restructure or possibly some reconsideration of I-AA or I-AAA, or

whatever it was, and some theory, in fact, that there would be a division-ending story. Throughout this Convention, I have heard from many people about the educational opportunities and the experiences that all of our athletes have had over the years. Yet, we are looking to eliminate some of these experiences possibly. I think it is important, especially when we hear some of our leaders in the NCAA talking about multiple-division problems and restructuring, and whatever else, that we continually let these athletes move up to Division I until we are sure in our own minds which way we are going in terms of multidivisions and restructuring. I urge your support and I urge all divisions, Divisions I, II and III, to support this issue.

Harley W. Lewis (University of Montana): Mr. Chair, I am a member of the Men's and Women's Track and Field Committee. On behalf of the Division I track and field subcommittee, I would like to speak against this issue. Divisions II and III have their own national championships. We feel strongly that Division I athletes should be allowed that same privilege. Divisions II and III athletes choose their level of competition and decide the role of Divisions II or III institutions. When they are allowed to enter Division I championships, we extend them more opportunities than is available to Division I athletes. In addition, if Divisions II and III athletes compete in Division I, they can impact the outcome of the team's scoring and deny the Division I athletes from advancing in the preliminary rounds in their sport. Please vote against this proposal and allow Division I to have its own championships and not create an NCAA all-sports event.

Paul E. Hartman (Oakland University): Oakland University is a Division II school, and we have been pleased over the past several years of having several world-class swimmers, swimmers that have taken part in the World University Games; the Friendship Games in Moscow, and most recently, the Olympics. The experience of several of these young men to move up in swimming to the Division I championships has been a real honor and something that is difficult to measure in terms of their accomplishments. I think that we are talking mainly about a small number of athletes in a very few sports; and to deny these few people the chance to compete with the best, I think would be wrong. I urge your support of this proposal.

Carol Stevenson (Women's Intercollegiate Cross Country Coaches Association): On behalf of the Women's Intercollegiate Cross Country Coaches Association, I would like to oppose this amendment. The number of participants in the national championship at the Division I level in cross country currently is far below the allowed ratio of one to 16. Until the ratio is brought in line, we oppose the inclusion of the Divisions II and III champions.

Alvin J. Van Wie (Wooster College): Mr. Chair, I am a member of the Division III Steering Committee. The Division III Steering Committee moves for defeat of this proposal. We have national championships opportunities for Division II and Division III. We still strongly think that Division I championships should be for Division

I athletes. For many years, the members of Division III have asked the Association membership to respect the integrity of each of the divisional championships. We strongly oppose moving up or moving down in any form. We urge defeat of No. 105.

[Proposal No. 105 (Page A-96) was defeated.]

[Note: The general business session was recessed for 15 minutes.]

Reconsideration of Football Evaluation Periods

Charles F. Taylor (University of Cincinnati): Mr. Chair, having voted on the prevailing side, I would move for reconsideration of Proposal No. 98 for Division I-A.

[The motion was seconded.]

Roy V. Kramer (Vanderbilt University): Mr. Chair, I believe it is entirely inappropriate to change the calendar that we voted in a few years ago. It may be appropriate to change the dates and when those evaluation periods occur; but as we did in the sport of basketball, that should be done by adjusting the entire calendar and giving up something at the other end, but not adding dates to that evaluation period. That violates the philosophy that was passed by this Convention for football and basketball to establish a recruiting calendar. I think we need to say that, that this amendment would violate that. Furthermore, it is not really a valuable tool, because most of our recruiting is done by the time that we are asking for time to be seen at these various high schools. Let's go back and let's readjust the calendar and do it appropriately.

John J. Crouthamel (Syracuse University): Our friends in Division I-AA recognize this as a recruiting advantage. In fact, that is the reason why they asked for reconsideration and, in fact, adopted it themselves. We are dealing with a recruiting period here. Several years ago, at the request of our coaches, we eliminated the months of September and October from this evaluation period for two primary reasons. One was on the basis of cost containment but also to keep our coaches on campus so they could be with their football teams. I would suggest that all we are doing is sending our coaches back out on Thursday evening and not allowing them to field their teams on Friday or, indeed, Saturday morning. I would ask for reconsideration of this. I would suspect if we reconsider it and defeat it that our brethren in Division I-AA will look at it in the same terms as they initially did when they rejected it.

[Proposal No. 98 (Page A-93) was defeated by Division I-A after a motion to reconsider was approved.]

Rescission of Football Evaluation Period

Harley W. Lewis (University of Montana): I would like to prevail upon the Convention to rescind the action of I-AA in approving Proposal No. 98.

[The motion was seconded.]

[Proposal No. 98 (Page A-93) was rescinded by the Convention for Division I-AA.]

Division III Football Championship

Alvin J. Van Wie (Wooster College): Mr. Chair, I move the

adoption of Proposal No. 106.

[The motion was seconded.]

At the current time, there are 260 institutions playing Division III football. At the current time, there are 114 institutions playing Division II football. The Division III Steering Committee feels that we have enough institutions outside of Division III playing in the Division III football championship. Hence, the Division III Steering Committee proposes No. 106 before the Convention. I should mention that Division I already has taken this action by passing Bylaw 10-3-(b) in 1984. With the support of the Council and the Executive Committee, I urge your support.

Howard Elwell (Gannon University): Mr. Chair, as a member of the steering committee, I move to refer this motion to the Special Committee to Review Membership Structure.

[The motion was seconded.]

This past year, there were several issues that came before the division steering committees with regard to multidivision classification issues. All of those issues were referred to the membership restructuring committee except this issue, so I would prevail on the Convention to let that committee hammer this out.

Judith M. Sweet (University of California, San Diego): Mr. Chair, I am a member of the Division III Steering Committee and of the Council. The Council supported the proposal that is before you. I speak against the motion to refer. This proposal has been before this body before. We have had the support of Division I, which grandfathered in those Division I institutions playing in Division III football. We are asking for the same consideration in Division II. I respectfully would like to correct the reference to the special membership structure committee. I believe that there has been only one issue and that had to do with I-AAA football, although the new committee will deal with multidivision classification in total.

It is extremely important to the Division III football institutions that they have an opportunity to play in their own championship. The proposal before the body does not preclude the Division II institutions from playing Division III football. It would only keep them from playing in Division III championships. I request your support to not refer.

Elwood N. Shields (Bentley College): Mr. President, as one of the affected institutions, I would urge approval of referral.

Raymond M. Burse (Kentucky State University): I rise to speak in behalf of referring this matter to the membership structure committee. The charge of that committee is to review the entire structure of the NCAA and bring to this Convention or suggest to Council recommendations on how best to structure this organization. Many issues have been referred to the committee, this being the only issue that I know of that has not specifically been referred. I realize that the institutions in Division III have a great many concerns, but I do not believe that they would be disadvantaged by waiting until the

committee brings to this Convention the entire package of the proper suggested structure for the NCAA.

William A. Marshall (Franklin and Marshall College): I speak against referral. As was mentioned earlier, it was brought before you before and there was an amendment proposed, which the proposer has not brought forward this time. Let me speak to that and also to the legislation itself. We have heard that we are trying to strengthen Division II; and yet, some Division II teams want to take their programs to other divisions. I think it is time that Division II go along with Divisions I and III and keep its programs in Division II, fund them and make Division II the kind of division it can be. This legislation would help do that. I urge you to vote against referral, and let's get this legislation voted through.

Robert G. Lawson (University of Kentucky): Mr. Chair, I would like to speak against referral. As mentioned previously, Division III is not and will not be disadvantaged by this. However, as a former chair of the Division III Football Championship Committee, I would like you to note that the Division III institutions already have been displaced in their national championships. Now is the time to make a decision.

Judith M. Sweet (University of California, San Diego): I just would like to add one more comment in support of not referring. The Division III Steering Committee, in the spirit of cooperation, is willing to support the amendment to the amendment. Although we would prefer the effective date that appears in 106, we are willing to support No. 106—1 to take care of those Division II institutions that believed they could participate in the Division III championship. We would like an opportunity to vote on that. Thank you.

[The motion to refer Proposal No. 106 (Page A-97) was defeated by Division I. Votes in the other divisions were not taken; motion required approval by all divisions.]

Howard Elwell (Gannon University): I would like to move the adoption of Proposal No. 106—1.

[The motion was seconded.]

Last fall, four Division II institutions initiated football. Their petitions were in; everything was approved in the summer, and they were classified in Division III in the fall, effective September 1, 1988, which we all know is the date that all changes in classification take place. These institutions all started their programs under the provisions of the current Bylaw 10-3-(b)-(2), which permits them to be eligible for consideration for the Division III football championship after a two-year waiting period. Should No. 106 pass as proposed, these institutions would never be eligible to compete for a football championship since Proposition 106 states that they had to be classified in Division III prior to September 1, 1988. Rarely at this Convention do we pass legislation that retroactively eliminates an option that any part of the membership currently enjoys. Favorable consideration of No. 106—1 would permit those institutions to continue to qualify as Division III football institutions and also

permit any institution currently planning to initiate football in the fall of 1989 to participate in the Division III football championship after a two-year waiting period should they otherwise qualify. I urge your support of Proposal No. 106—1.

Judith M. Sweet (University of California, San Diego): I would like to speak in support of the amendment. In the spirit of harmony and cooperation, we would like to support the concerns of our Division II colleagues and in turn we hope that Division II will support us on the main motion.

Elwood N. Shields (Bentley College): I want to thank my colleagues in Division III for their support on the amendment. I would remind the Convention, though, this amendment to the amendment is to allow the grandfather clause and to allow the correction. This technicality would require passage in all three divisions. If the amendment to the amendment is not successful in passing all three divisions, we would have to ask Division II support in turning down this proposal. I want to thank Division III and urge Division II to support the amendment to the amendment and urge Division I to do the same as reflected by the proposals.

[Proposal No. 106—1 (Page A-97) was approved by all divisions.]

Alvin J. Van Wie (Wooster College): Division III has demonstrated its good faith by supporting No. 106—1, grandfathering in those Division II schools that enter our division in football no later than September 1, 1989. We feel it is time for members of Division II to return the good will by showing their respect for the Division III championships that has been demonstrated for other championships in this Association. I urge the passage of No. 106.

[Proposal No. 106 (Page A-97) was approved as amended by No. 106—1. Motion to refer to Special Committee to Review the NCAA Membership Structure defeated by Division I, vote in other divisions not announced; approval of each division required.]

Team Championships

Royce N. Flippin Jr. (Massachusetts Institute of Technology): On behalf of the Division III Championship Committee and the sponsors as listed, I move the adoption of Proposal No. 107.

[The motion was seconded.]

This proposal would eliminate a provision of Executive Regulation 1-3(i) for Division III conferences only. The current regulation was adopted by the membership in the 1981 Convention. It should be noted that the regulation is not related to automatic qualification; and therefore, it does not affect conferences that have automatic qualification in their particular sport. In effect, the current regulation requires a governing sports committee to select the conference champion for an NCAA championship before it selects any other team from the conference, unless the conference chooses to waive the regulation at the beginning of the academic year.

While the intent of the original regulation was to enhance conference championships by insuring that the champion is selected before

other conference members, it can work to a conference's disadvantage. The following situation is typical. Institution "A" wins its conference football championship with a conference record of 6-1 and an overall record of 6-5. Institution "B" finishes in second place with a conference record of 6-1 and an overall record of 10-1. If the conference does not have an automatic berth, no governing sports committee would be obligated to take either team. But if it wished to select the 10-1 team, it now must first select the 6-5 conference champion. The chances are that the sports committee may not select the 6-5 team and the conference is then left without a participating institution in the championship.

Our conferences are beginning to realize this possible scenario and are applying the waiver provision. For example, in the current 1988-89 championships, 10 out of 17 Division III conferences are sponsoring men's championships and 13 of the 21 conferences are sponsoring women's championships, waiving this current regulation for all sports. If 60 percent of the Division III conferences are waiving this regulation, it appears that it is no longer effective and should be eliminated. The Division III Championship Committee supports Proposal No. 107.

[Proposal No. 107 (Page A-97) was approved.]

Student-Athlete Statement—Automobile and Loan Information

Fred Jacoby (Southwest Athletic Conference): I move the adoption of Proposal No. 109.

[The motion was seconded.]

Proposal No. 109 would require the student-athlete to provide automobile registration and loan information annually at the time the student-certification form is signed in August or early September. One of the first indicators of the receipt of the extra benefits to a student-athlete is the type of automobile that the student drives. Student-athletes want wheels. This legislative proposal would discourage use of this extra benefit under falsification of the student's certification form. This is a preventative proposal that deserves your careful consideration. If you elect not to pass No. 109, I would strongly urge you to consider utilizing the procedure on an institutional basis as a preventative measure at the Division I level.

Douglas W. Weaver (Michigan State University): We currently require our athletes through our statements to sign many, many forms and to sign away in many ways the rights of privacy far in excess of other students, faculties, staff and coaches on our campus. We should be careful that in our zeal to find a Trans Am under every bush that we don't subject our athletes again to this type of thing, charging them with guilt and forcing them to prove their own innocence. If we pass this, we can expect to be back next year with loan statements for musical instruments and probably clothes. I agree with Fred that this is left best to the institution.

[Proposal No. 109 (Page A-99) was defeated.]

High School All-Star Games

Prentice Gautt (Big Eight Conference): On behalf of the sponsors,

I move the adoption of Proposal No. 110.

[The motion was seconded.]

Succinctly, because the Association no longer certifies high school all-star football and basketball games, it no longer appears to be necessary to restrict the participation of prospective student-athletes in such games. This proposal would resolve this incongruence by eliminating the restrictions on such high school all-star competition. I ask your support of this proposal.

Fred Jacoby (Southwest Athletic Conference): I rise to speak in opposition to No. 110. The rationale for passing legislation some 10 years ago to limit participation in high school all-star games to two games is still valid today. Without the two-game restriction, we had high school players participating in as many as eight games during the second semester following the end of the high school basketball season. The problems created are the following:

1. Academic work during the second semester will drop off dramatically. Grades will decrease and college ACT and SAT test scores will be down because of the missed class time.

2. High school students will drop spring sports to participate in all-star games.

3. Private promoters will add all-star games to profit from the gate receipts, charging coaches to view the practices and games with short evaluation and contact periods. Now, it is logical to believe that the number of all-star games would increase. We would have city, county, state and all kinds of different all-star games.

4. The number of all-star games that a student participates in becomes a bragging match and a symbol or indicator of how the prospect was rated by college coaches. Thus, the student thought he had to play as many games as he was invited to.

In interviewing a number of college freshmen, I was told that the first two games were fun but after that it became a drag and a hassle. When a student left his hotel room, he was being attacked by college coaches or self-assigned college talent scouts. A limit of two high school all-star games is good legislation. I strongly urge you to vote "no" on Proposal No. 110 and retain the two-game limit. Don't turn the calendar back to what we had 10 years ago.

[Proposal No. 110 (Page A-99) was defeated.]

Major Junior A Ice Hockey

From the floor: I move adoption of Proposal No. 111.

[The motion was seconded.]

Proposal No. 111 has the support and endorsement of Hockey East, CCHA and WCHA, and ECAC Ice Hockey memberships. The amendment to Case 37 establishes a minimal penalty for ice hockey players who participate in major exhibition games during the regular season. With respect to undergraduates involved, aid would be denied their first year of intercollegiate competition for the loss of one year of competition in the sport of ice hockey. The proposal would

provide a more consistent application of penalties in the handling of specific major junior A ice hockey and NCAA appeals cases in the future years.

[Proposal No. 111 (Page A-100) was approved.]

Incidental Expenses—Olympic Festival Volleyball Tryouts

Kathleen J. DeBoer (University of Kentucky): I move the adoption of Proposal No. 112.

[The motion was seconded.]

Karen L. Miller (California State Polytechnic University, Pomona): May I ask on behalf of the Council members of the Division II subcommittee that we refer this matter to the Special Committee to Review Amateurism Issues?

[The motion was seconded.]

We ask that this referral be made due to many of the questions that are raised in this and the concerns regarding other sports. We feel it would be beneficial to have it reviewed by this committee, and thus we urge the recommendation for referral.

Kathleen J. DeBoer (University of Kentucky): Currently, volleyball and basketball tryouts are conducted at three or four sites around the country. Most of the participants being 19 years of age and under, and many come from our colleges and universities. Currently, we are allowed to pay for our women's basketball and men's basketball players to participate in these tryouts. We are not allowed the same latitude for our volleyball players to participate in similar types of tryouts. In the interest of fairness, I urge you to adopt this legislation so that we can treat our volleyball players the same as our basketball players in a similar type of competition and tryout activity.

[Proposal No. 112 (Page A-101) was referred to the Special Committee to Review Amateurism Issues. See Page A-101 for subsequent voting action.]

Summer Basketball

Stephen Erber (State University of New York, Binghamton): Mr. Chair, on behalf of the six member institutions in the State University of New York Athletic Conference, I move the adoption of Proposal No. 113.

[The motion was seconded.]

The intent of Proposal No. 113 merely is to move the legislation dealing with summer basketball from the constitution to the bylaws so that it can be implemented on a division basis and thus allow Division III to get out from under the summer-basketball legislation. It is the feeling of the sponsors that summer-basketball legislation falls outside the umbrella of Division III philosophy. In this regard, we offer the following observations:

1. Summer-basketball legislation originally was intended for major-college basketball.

2. Division III employs a large number of part-time coaches and, consequently, finds it extremely difficult to monitor compliance with

summer-basketball leagues.

3. It is the philosophy of Division III that inasmuch as possible student-athletes be treated the same as students in general.

Proposal No. 113 serves the interest of federation, and it serves the interest of deregulation. We request your support for this proposal.

John M. Schael (Washington University (Missouri)): Just a few minutes ago, we thought our Division III athletes should have the best opportunities and, therefore, move from Division III national championships and advance on to Division I national championships. I think we should have the same feeling in regard to the opportunities for people that play basketball in the summer. I think this is not within the philosophy of Division III. I urge defeat.

Mr. Erber: Again, this legislation would not do anything to prevent Division III athletes from participating in summer basketball. In fact, it would do just the opposite. It would open it up so they wouldn't have the restrictions that we currently have in place.

[Proposal No. 113, Part A (Page A-101) was approved. Part B was approved by all divisions. See Page A-101 for subsequent voting action.]

Transfer Rule—One-Time Exception

Ralph McFillen (Metropolitan Collegiate Athletic Conference): I move, on behalf of the Metro Conference, the adoption of Proposal No. 116.

[The motion was seconded.]

This proposal would reduce the hypocrisy that currently exists in the amplification of Bylaw 5-1-(m)-(13) by eliminating the consideration of the student-athlete's financial aid status at the institution as a requirement of this provision. Currently, there are six provisions in Bylaw 5-1-(m)-(13). According to the second provision, which we are addressing here, the student-athlete's aid must not be renewed for the ensuing academic year for reasons unrelated to transfer. We believe there are three valid reasons to eliminate this criteria. One, it has not been applied uniformly by the membership. Two, there are certain questions regarding falsification of information that occurs; and finally, three, financial aid criteria appears to be unnecessary.

Some people are fearful of the change and argue that passage of this proposal would result in mass transfer. We do not believe that to be the case. Keep in mind that this restriction applies to sports other than football, basketball and ice hockey. Keep in mind, also, that there is a criterion in this waiver that, in fact, will affect the way the previous institution must provide consent for the transfer to occur. Let's stop placing the coaches in a position where they make up a reason to grade after a student-athlete has come into their office and requested a transfer, and the coach wishes to grant this transfer.

It has been my experience as a commissioner in Division I and Division II that the passage of this legislation would be beneficial to this Association. I urge your support to eliminate this unnecessary and difficult-to-administer rule.

Charles Whitcomb (San Jose State University): Mr. Chair, I am a member of the Council. The Council opposes this legislation. This proposal would eliminate the extension of the section on residency requirements for a student to be eligible at a Division I or Division II member institution. In the legislation, which initially was adopted in 1984, the primary purpose was to provide an opportunity for a student-athlete, if financial aid was not renewed by his or her original institution, to transfer to a new institution and to be eligible immediately. This was to provide a break for a student-athlete who originally had enrolled in the first institution because of the financial aid offer. It appears to the Council that this requirement remains appropriate to the regulation. If the purpose of this proposal is to provide for a broad general exception to the residency-transfer requirement, it should be done for a specific new exception, which makes that clear, not to the dilution of the primary criterion and the existing exception. The Council urges you to defeat this legislation.

Thomas E. Yeager (Colonial Athletic Association): I would like to rise in support of Proposal No. 116. This legislation has been on the books about five years; and from day one, what the membership has been saying is, in essence, I don't want to penalize the student. I want to accommodate that student's transfer request. If the membership is looking for a way to say that in sports other than football, basketball and ice hockey, and with the consent of the institution, they do not object to a student getting a one-time waiver of the transfer rule, then we ought to adopt this piece of legislation. It still requires that the student be in good academic standing and requires the permission of the first institution. I think that in practice it is something that we all have been doing since the adoption of the rule. Thank you.

Karen L. Miller (California State Polytechnic University, Pomona): On behalf of the Council and as a member of the Division II Steering Committee, I speak in opposition to this. We feel in Division II that this has many ramifications that will affect us and that the original intent definitely is diminished by this. We feel the transfer rule is a valid one as it stands; and that if it were to be changed, there is the possibility of tampering with our ratings of various institutions.

[Proposal No. 116 (Page A-106) was defeated by Divisions I and II; moot for Division III due to approval of No. 115.]

Reconsideration of Summer Basketball

Eldridge W. Roark Jr. (Plattsburgh State University College): Having voted on the prevailing side on Proposal No. 113-B in Division III, I would like to move for reconsideration.

[The motion was seconded.]

Stephen Erber (State University of New York, Binghamton): The intent of Proposal No. 113 was to get Division III out from under the summer-basketball legislation; and in order to do that, Division III needed to vote down Part B so it no longer was part of their bylaws. I am not sure that Division III delegates understood that.

[Proposal No. 113—B (Page A-102) was defeated by Division III]

after motion to reconsider was approved. See Page A-103 for subsequent voting action.]

Transfer Rule—One-Time Exception

Jeffrey H. Orleans (Council of Ivy Group Presidents): Mr. Chair, on behalf of the sponsors, I move the adoption of Proposal No. 117.

[The motion was seconded.]

Mr. Chair, this is a very limited exception to the one-time transfer exception. It applies in the case of a student who is receiving athletically related aid, who has dropped from the team and whose institution chooses to continue that aid even if the student has been dropped from the team and then chooses the transfer. The exception would be designed to allow that student then to compete without having to sit out and the transferring institution to do what we all hope to do, which is to continue the aid and drop him from the team. It has nothing to do with the type of institution to which the student transfers; but it is designed simply to allow the institution, which continues aid after dropping the student from the team, to then certify his eligibility. On that basis, we would ask for the Convention's approval.

[Proposal No. 117 was approved by Divisions I (157-121) and II (106-46); moot for Division III due to approval of No. 115.]

Junior College Transfer Student—Dropped Sport

Allen R. Bohl (University of Toledo): Mr. Chair, I move the adoption of Proposal No. 118.

[The motion was seconded.]

Proposal No. 118 clarifies the eligibility of a qualifier who transfers to a junior college after first attending a four-year institution that did not sponsor the student-athlete's sport.

As indicated in the intent paragraph of the proposal, such a student would be subject to the same bylaws that apply to any qualifier who attends junior college. We encourage your support.

[Proposal No. 118 (Page A-106) was approved by Divisions I and II.]

Reconsideration of Pell Grants

James R. Benbrook (University of Houston): Having voted on the prevailing side on Proposal No. 40, I wish to move for reconsideration.

[The motion was seconded.]

Cedric W. Dempsey (University of Arizona): Mr. Chair, as I indicated Monday, I support the concept of considering additional aid for athletes. When I leave this Convention, I would like to be remembered for that concept. I do feel that since we have approved the establishment of the committee to study financial aid that we should give that committee full opportunity to do so. Therefore, I would speak against the motion to reconsider.

[Reconsideration of Proposal No. 40 (Page A-27) was defeated by Division I, 120-189; roll-call vote.]

[Note: A motion to rescind Division III's defeat of No. 113-B was

ruled out of order.]

Reconsideration of Summer Basketball

Thomas J. Niland Jr. (Le Moyne College): I move for reconsideration by Division II of Proposal No. 113-B.

[The motion was seconded.]

I think this is a tremendous advantage. I originally was involved—I am not as old as a lot of you, but I am older than many of you here—with the summer-basketball rule. The rule was put in for a real purpose. I would hate to bring up the number of items that we are concerned with. They are all bad. Now, we have a rule that allows one division very close in competitive nature to play summer basketball, and I want to get that wiped out, but now you will not allow me to do that. I don't want that advantage to stay. So, I would like to have Division II players play in summer basketball leagues unsupervised the same as Division III. I trust Division II would do this.

[Reconsideration by Division II of Proposal No. 113-B (Page A-102) was defeated.]

Reconsideration of Incidental Expenses— Olympic Festival Volleyball Tryouts

Chris Voelz (University of Minnesota, Twin Cities): Mr. President, having voted on the prevailing side for No. 112, I move for reconsideration of the motion to refer.

[The motion was seconded.]

Donna A. Lopiano (University of Texas, Austin): The USOC Olympic Festival is this coming year. If we refer No. 112 to the committee, the opportunity is lost for the funding for the youngsters. The system for qualifying them for the festival has changed drastically in that instead of having three chances, three sites within three geographical zones for our kids to go out and qualify, there is only one site in each of the three zones. This is a tremendous hardship on our students, which we handle for our basketball players but not for the volleyball players. I would urge you just to reconsider this. We can always overturn it or refer it to that committee for continued consideration. But we should give them a chance to be funded this year. May I also point out that these are the only two sports, basketball and volleyball, that impose age limits for the Olympic Festival and that restrict their participation to youngsters and that conduct tournaments during the academic year. There are no other opportunities for these kids to go.

Charlotte West (Southern Illinois University, Carbondale): I, too, would like to support the motion to reconsider. I will try not to be redundant to the points that Donna has made; but without this reconsideration, there are financially disadvantaged athletes that will not have an opportunity to try out for the national team. The publicity in the sport for women's volleyball is not so extensive that some very highly skilled athletes may be precluded from attending if they are not supported financially by our institutions, especially in Divisions II and III. So, I urge your positive vote for reconsideration,

remembering that it is permissive and schools will select the people that they think are of national quality that should really be in the tryouts.

[The motion to reconsider Proposal No. 112 (Page A-101) was approved.]

Kathleen J. DeBoer (University of Kentucky): Mr. Chair, there is no problem with studying this issue in terms of amateurism or professionalism, and the intent of asking you to reconsider this motion is not to go against that study. It is simply to say that because we have festival tryouts occurring this spring for both volleyball and men's and women's basketball, we should treat our athletes equally and then go ahead and study the implications of amateurism versus professionalism for each sport. But, give them an opportunity to participate in this summer's Olympic Festival on an equal basis.

[Proposal No. 112 (Page A-101) was approved. See Page A-101 for earlier voting action.]

Junior College Transfer Waiver—Limited Preseason Tryouts

Clayton W. Chapman (Eastern College Athletic Conference): On behalf of the Council, I move adoption of Proposal No. 119.

[The motion was seconded.]

The intent of this proposal is to clarify two of the provisions of Bylaw 5-1(n)-(3), which is a two-year college-transfer waiver for Division II, and to make those provisions consistent with those of Bylaw 5-1(n)-(10), similar for transfers from four-year colleges. First, it clarifies that the condition relating to the nonrecruitment of student-athletes applies only to the certifying institution. Further, the proposal specifies that the transfer student may have participated in limited preseason tryouts and still qualify for a waiver so long as the student did not otherwise practice or compete prior to the transfer. The other requirements of this waiver provision would remain the same. This proposal would provide for greater consistency in the NCAA transfer legislation, and I urge its adoption.

[Proposal No. 119 (Page A-107) was approved by Division II, moot for Division III due to approval of No. 115.]

[Note: A motion to set aside the scheduled 5:30 p.m. adjournment was approved.]

"Restricted Membership"—Probationary Period

Eileen B. Livingston (Duquesne University): I move the adoption of Proposal No. 122.

[The motion was seconded.]

Albert M. Witte (University of Arkansas, Fayetteville): On behalf of the Council, I move the adoption of Proposal No. 122—1.

[The motion was seconded.]

Mr. President, the Council believes that we need a mandatory restricted status for those institutions that do not support adequately all parts of their programs. We know that in the past some institutions have not met this standard, especially in women's programs. However, we also know that some violations are relatively minor and

do not deserve mandatory restricted status. In fact, yesterday, Division I considered several such cases. We believe that the amendment to the amendment would give the Council the authority to determine on a case-by-case basis whether an institution has failed to meet its division sports-sponsorship requirement and thus deserves mandatory restricted status, or whether it should receive a one-year probationary period. I remind the delegates that this could occur only once every 10 years. It is the Council's view that this opportunity should not be automatic in all cases but only in those that are relatively minor. I urge the delegates to support the amendment to the amendment.

Eileen B. Livingston (Duquesne University): I oppose Amendment No. 122—1. I appreciate the increased sensitivity of the NCAA Council. The amendment, however, does not address the issue that the penalty does not fit the crime. A school still will be in the restricted category and will not know until after the waiting period by the NCAA Council whether it is able to compete in championships or not. Then if the school is not granted a waiver, the penalty does not fit the crime. Remember, we are talking about a lack of change of participatory events. This is not like the infractions cases where the consideration is whether and how much of an unfair competitive advantage was gained. There is no cheating to win, and the only cheating is against one's own program. Being placed on probation and only once in every 10 years, allows a school to self-report, focus attention internally to correct problems. If this doesn't happen within a year, then the restricted status certainly will provide the impetus to correct the problems. Most schools want to abide by the Association's rules and regulations. Probation fits the crime. I urge you to reject this amendment and vote for No. 122.

Don Leahy (Creighton University): I, too, speak against the amendment, because it will lead to a number of highly subjective judgments, judgments not required, should 122 pass as originally presented. A case in point; I refer to yesterday's Division I business session when four appeals were considered. I could not help but admire the subjective wisdom of the assembly that said yes to three and no to one. Even greater subjective wisdom was shown when this assembly supported the recommendation of the steering committee in one case and opposed it in another.

Granted, the amendment creates a different format of appeal; but the subjectivity remains. Had No. 122 been in place, yesterday's proceedings would not have been necessary. All of those institutions would have had a probationary year. Another issue to consider, why did those four institutions find themselves in the restricted category? Did they provide cars and cash to athletes? Obviously, no. I have before me a newspaper article which lists a number of nationally prominent institutions currently faced with severe penalties for such violations as cash gifts to recruits, cars to athletes, extra benefits for athletes, improper this and improper that, and the list goes on. As you know, if those penalties are for football, for example, the fact that the

basketball program and all other programs go untouched seems logical. However, an institution in the restricted category for want of a golfer or a track person finds its entire program being severely punished.

Let common sense prevail, please. Let's avoid highly subjective judgments when they are not necessary. Let's allow an institution to correct deficiencies during a one-time probationary year. The legislation states, as it should, improve in one year or else. It makes the issue clear-cut. Let's defeat this subjective nature of the amendment and pass 122 as originally presented.

Joe A. Gore (Valdosta State College): The rationale presented for the amendment was to prevent intentional use of the privilege. Any institution that intentionally takes advantage of this privilege provided by the proposal certainly will be rolling the dice and certainly will be taking a chance since it can utilize this privilege only one time in 10 years. Therefore, when there is a genuine need to use the privilege allowed here by the proposal, the institution will not have that opportunity. Thus, the school will be placed particularly in jeopardy. We encourage you to defeat the amendment and pass the proposal as originally stated.

[Proposal No. 122—1 (Page A-110) was defeated by Divisions II and III, vote not announced in Division I; approval of each division required.]

Eileen B. Livingston (Duquesne University): As a conscientious delegate to the NCAA and a true believer in the democratic process of this Convention, I wish to state that the main issue regarding 122 is that currently the penalty does not fit the crime. The restricted status is too severe. Often, it penalizes the university and involved coaches and teams. It has a devastating effect on motivation and morale. Most of the institutions are committed to following the rules and regulations and philosophy of the NCAA. A school is cited for noncompliance in the area of participants in the events. That school has not cheated as in the case of an infraction to earn an unfair advantage in competition. That school has cheated on its own program and student-athletes. Most institutions will not want that to happen again. Most presidents will not let that happen again. Even being placed on probation isn't easy. Immediately, your alumni is upset. The proposed legislation only permits one probationary period every 10 years.

So this addresses the issue of an unscrupulous school using this bylaw to perpetuate a program that is not in compliance, a program that doesn't meet the criteria of the Division I membership. In addition, the knowledge that the first time that the program is not in compliance will warrant a year of probation may provide the opportunity to an athletics director for self-reporting for a noncompliance situation. This self-reporting may provide the interest for coaches and athletes to be focused on the needs of an athletics program to insure that it is a short-term problem.

[Proposal No. 122 (Page A-109) was approved by all divisions.]

"Restricted Membership" Waiver

Sarah E. J. Yates (Florida A&M University): Mr. President, on behalf of the Council, I move adoption of Proposal No. 123.

[The motion was seconded.]

The intent of this proposal is to allow our member institution that receive a waiver of the "restricted membership" classification under NCAA Bylaw 10-1-(g)-(1) to receive an immediate change in membership status. Bylaw 10-1-(g)-(1) allows an institution applying for multidivision classification, or change of Division I membership or an institution placed in the restricted-membership category to request a waiver of the criteria from the membership of its preferred division. Currently, for those institutions whose waiver request has been approved, Bylaw 10-1-(g)-(4) sets forth the effective dates for those institutions applying for membership in the Association or seeking multidivision classification or change of division. However, Bylaw 10-1-(g)-(4) does not set forth an effective date for an institution placed in the restricted-membership category whose waiver request has been approved. Because an approval of request restores the institution to its original status, the institution should be allowed to receive an immediate change in membership status. On behalf of the Council, we urge your support.

[Proposal No. 123 (Page A-111) was approved by all divisions.]

James W. Shaffer (Midwestern Collegiate Conference): On behalf of the NCAA Council, I move adoption of Proposal No. 124.

[The motion was seconded.]

NCAA Bylaw 11-4-(b) sets forth a minimum number of intercollegiate contests an institution's team shall engage in during the academic year in order to meet sports sponsorship criteria of Bylaw 5-1-(j). Currently, in individual sports, an institution-versus-institution meeting is counted in multiteam competitions in determining if an institution has participated in the minimum number of contests. This can be accomplished in certain individual sports by hosting or participating in one large multiteam competition. The intent of this proposal is to limit the number of institution-versus-institution meetings that shall be counted as contests in any multiteam competition to no more than two for purposes of meeting the sports-sponsorship criteria in an individual sport. Thus, if an institution competes in a multiteam competition, such as a quadrangular meet where institution-by-institution scores are recorded, the institution may use no more than two institution-versus-institution meetings for purposes of meeting the sports-sponsorship criteria in that sport. Thank you.

Bill Byrne (University of Oregon): Mr. Chair, I am troubled by this proposal, especially in the sport of cross country. For a school like Oregon and others on the quarter system, we don't start school until the first part of October. We don't have these types of meets. We have to bring in more and more of our athletes earlier. That will increase our expenses. Secondly, if we do meet the criteria, that means that we

have to run and race against schools every weekend prior to the conference championships. When you are asking athletes to race 10,000 meters, they need some time to recover. You are going to harm your athletes by asking them to compete more often than they need to.

[Proposal No. 124 (Page A-112) was approved by Divisions II and III, defeated by Division I.]

[Note: Proposal Nos. 127 and 129 were withdrawn.]

Football Coaches Retirement Trust Benefit Game

Bill Byrne (University of Oregon): I would like to move adoption of Proposal No. 129.

[The motion was seconded.]

Bill Byrne (University of Oregon): I move adoption of Proposal No. 129—1.

[The motion was seconded.]

This may come as a surprise to the delegates. Football coaching is not a very stable profession. I told you that you would be surprised. What this would do is allow a football game to be played earlier in the year where the proceeds would go to establish a retirement trust for football coaches.

Gary A. Cunningham (California State University, Fresno): The National Association of Collegiate Directors of Athletics will be the sponsor of the game if this legislation passes. As president of the National Association of Collegiate Directors of Athletics, I was asked by our officers to take this proposal to the Division I-A directors meeting on Monday for a straw vote. The vote was 45 in favor of the proposal and 18 against. I would like to emphasize that the game would not replace the Freedom Bowl. The game would be coordinated with the current Kickoff Classic that is played at the Meadowlands each year and would adhere to the same parameters. The selection of the teams would be coordinated with the Kickoff Classic and the game would be played prior to the start of the traditional football season.

Disney would commit \$1 million each year as the game sponsor. In addition to the dollars paid to the two participating teams, the game would benefit the American Football Coaches Retirement Fund and the National Football Foundation for Postgraduate Scholarship Fund. I would urge your support of Proposal No. 129.

John Mackovic (University of Illinois, Champaign): This game is being sponsored by the American Football Coaches Association Retirement Trust to give an opportunity to assistant coaches at all levels to be part of a retirement program that is funded with no proceeds from any university or college. The game is being supported in that vein. I know that the coaches would not favor a 12th game, but this is an exception to that. They are in favor of it very much. On behalf of the American Football Coaches Association especially, I urge your support at this time.

Harvey W. Schiller (Southeastern Conference): I would like to

speak in behalf of the proposal. The game will present a unique opportunity in college football and promote interest in the sport itself.

[Proposal No. 129—1 (Page A-115) was approved by all divisions.]

Roy V. Kramer (Vanderbilt University): I believe this is a highly inappropriate piece of legislation for the following reasons. Number one, we are sending a message that we are going to bring our athletes back early. We are going to take them out of summer situations, including summer class or summer jobs. We are going to bring them back for the purpose of playing a game for the benefit of the coaches and athletics directors at a time when we are under a great deal of criticism about the type of aid we are giving athletes to start with. We are now turning around and going to play a game for the benefit of coaches and use athletes for that purpose. That is a misuse of our athletes. It is inappropriate. I am highly in favor of the American Football Coaches Association, but we need to find a better way to help them retire than using our student-athletes.

Glen C. Tuckett (Brigham Young University): For those of you who have not made up your mind as yet, although I heard the applause, our university has had the opportunity to be involved in the preseason Kickoff Classic and it was positive. We have had the privilege of being at the Freedom Bowl in Anaheim twice in the last three years, and we could not have been treated better. They do things with class and dignity. We are talking about the assistant football coaches who are somewhat nomadic in nature and need help. We are talking about scholarships. We are talking about Disneyland. We are talking about an opportunity to do something for some people that don't have much done for them. I would urge your support.

[Proposal No. 129 (Page A-114) was approved by all divisions (Division I-A, 61-47) as amended by No. 129—1.]

Postseason Tournament Exemption—Division III Football

President Bailey: Proposal No. 139, which was postponed, is before Division III now.

[Proposal No. 139 (Page A-119) was defeated by Division III.]

Postseason Tournament Exemption—Division III Football

President Bailey: Proposal No. 140, which was postponed, is before Division III now.

William A. Moore (State University of New York, Albany): Mr. Chair, on behalf of several institutions identified as sponsoring this proposal, as well as 41 other members of the Eastern College Athletic Conference, I speak in favor of Proposal No. 140, which would permit a Division III member institution's football team to exempt from the applicable contest limitation its participation in a conference-sponsored postseason tournament, not to exceed one contest for any one member institution, between teams that are not identified until the end of the regular season. Presently, there are 89 ECAC Division III institutions sponsoring football. Proposal No. 140 would give the teams that finish their season with outstanding records but that have not been chosen for the NCAA postseason play the opportunity

to have postseason experience. We ask for support of this proposal.

Patricia A. Rogers (State University of New York, Albany): On behalf of the Division III Steering Committee, I rise to clarify the rationale leading to the results of Proposal No. 139 by the Steering Committee and to urge your support of Proposal No. 140. At our October meeting, the steering committee formulated legislation purported unacceptable for allowing Division III institution's football programs to exempt from the football-contest limitations the participation in a conference-sponsored tournament between teams that are not selected to compete in NCAA postseason competition.

Please note that this would not be an exemption, inasmuch as each institution would be limited to exempting not more than a specific number of contests to be decided by the Division III football-playing membership. That number originally proposed by the steering committee, as you know, was two. However, at our pre-Convention meeting discussing Proposal No. 140, it became apparent that one contest exemption would be sufficient to accommodate a postseason opportunity in those conferences desiring such opportunities. As a member of the steering committee and a delegate from one of the sponsoring institutions, I urge your support of Proposal No. 140.

Robert C. Deming (Ithaca College): I rise to support this legislation. This would allow us to treat the sport of football in the ECAC at the championship level as we are treating the other sports. It also comes at an appropriate time as far as some of the regional concepts that are being considered in other areas. In football, the conferences could plan a postseason game. I would urge Division III football to support this.

[Proposal No. 140 (Page A-120) was approved by Division III after being postponed until the general business session.]

Recruiting Contacts

David Price (Pacific-10 Conference): On behalf of the Council and the deregulation committee, I move the adoption of Proposal No. 143.

[The motion was seconded.]

For a variety of reasons, our committee chose to concentrate our efforts on a national revision. That chore was completed with the adoption of Proposal No. 69 earlier today. Our second chore, to regulate and simplify the rules, has proven to be more frustrating. Although we actively solicited suggestions from the membership, almost without fail the recommendations we received were for a different version of the rule rather than having the rules simplified or eliminated. Nevertheless, we have sent several proposals forward to the Council for review. Survivors of this are Proposal Nos. 143 through 147. We believe approval of them will serve as a signal that the membership is serious about deregulation, and we ask that you examine these proposals in that light.

Proposal No. 143 represents an attempt to simplify our recruiting contact rule. We currently have six different rules governing this

area. Proposal No. 143 would fold them into one rule for all the Divisions I and II sports. It takes a current contact rule for women's basketball and applies it across the board. The institutions would have the privilege of a contact period at the high school. It could allow three contacts at the high school and three away from the high school. In the spirit of simplifying our rules, we urge your support of Proposal No. 143.

[Proposal No. 143 (Page A-123) was approved by Divisions I and II.]

Promotional Activities

Donna A. Lopiano (University of Texas, Austin): On behalf of the Council and the deregulation committee, I move adoption of Proposal No. 144.

[The motion was seconded.]

This is another opportunity for the membership to consider whether it wants to deregulate. Proposal No. 144 presents us with an opportunity to take five different rules and reduce them to one, while allowing member institutions and charitable organizations greater flexibility in using the student's name, picture or appearances for charitable/educational activities. Some examples: Under the current rule, there is a restriction on the use of a student-athlete's name or picture in paper products. Proposal No. 144 would permit institutions, for instance, to sell T-shirts with the name or picture of a student-athlete on them. Under the current rule, it would prohibit an institution from paying expenses in taking an athlete and alumni to a fund-raiser outside of the 30-mile radius from the campus. Proposal No. 144 would permit institutions to pay expenses for in-state trips or trips within 100 miles of campus by the institution as long as the student-athlete doesn't miss class. If you would like to open up this area, while retaining the controls of written approval of the athletics director and no missed classes on the part of the student-athletes, you should vote in support of No. 144.

[Proposal No. 144 (Page A-124) was approved.]

Recruiting Contacts—Banquets and Meetings

David Price (Pacific-10 Conference): On behalf of the Council and the deregulation committee, I move the adoption of Proposal No. 145.

[The motion was seconded.]

Proposal No. 145 permits a Division I or II basketball or football coach to speak at a meeting or banquet outside of the contact period, so long as the coach does not make a recruiting presentation in conjunction with the appearance and has no direct contact with any prospects in attendance. We believe that these two provisions are sufficient to protect the integrity of the rule if the proposal will eliminate the confusion that currently exists. We ask for your support.

[Proposal No. 145 (Page A-126) was approved by Divisions I and II.]

**Travel to NCAA Championships and Special Events
During Vacation Period**

Donna A. Lopiano (University of Texas, Austin): On behalf of the Council and the deregulations committee, I move adoption of Proposal No. 146.

[The motion was seconded.]

For those of you who have ever tried to decipher Case No. 87 or 88, this is a gift. Instead of trying to figure out a complex entitlement rule, under Proposal No. 146 the institution may choose among three simple alternatives and select the one that most benefits the student or only the one that you might understand.

[Proposal No. 146 (Page A-127) was approved.]

Preseason Practice—Football

Clayton W. Chapman (Eastern College Athletic Conference): Mr. President, on behalf of the Council and the deregulation committee, I move adoption of Proposal No. 147.

[The motion was seconded.]

The intent of No. 147 is to simplify the calculating of the starting date for preseason football practice and allows all institutions the maximum of 29 practice opportunities prior to its first scheduled intercollegiate football game. Under current legislation, an institution has three options for calculating that starting date and the adoption of this proposal would eliminate two of those options, which are rarely used, leaving only the third option, which allows all institutions an equal amount of practice time and simplifying the method for the calculations.

[Proposal No. 147 (Page A-128) was approved by all divisions.]

President Bailey: I think in view of the action on these last several proposals that it is appropriate for me to make a comment that perhaps I should have made following No. 69 when there was a round of applause. David made comments that certainly appeared to credit the chair of the Manual revision committee with more credit than is deserved, and it would be remiss on my part if I did not recognize before this assembly the other members of that committee. They were Prentice Gautt of the Big Eight Conference; Clayton Chapman of the ECAC; Donna Lopiano, University of Texas, Austin, and David Price, Pacific-10 Conference. (Applause)

COMMITTEE REPORTS

[Note: The delegates heard the report of the Men's and Women's Committees on Committees and Nominating Committee and approved the slate of candidates.]

**SUPPLEMENT TO MEMORIAL RESOLUTIONS
COMMITTEE REPORT**

Joanne Fortunato (Keene State College): Mr. President and delegates, I would like to add the following names to the Memorial Resolutions Committee report:

William Donaldson, Hiram College

William Exum, Kentucky State University

Robert M. Jones, Clemson University
Bob O'Connell, University of Massachusetts, Amherst
Sally Olgilvie, University of Massachusetts, Amherst
Franklin Otis, Lake Superior State University
Rob Roy Purdy, Vanderbilt University
Betty Richey, Vassar College

CLOSING REMARKS

Eugene F. Corrigan (Atlantic Coast Conference): At the honors luncheon, you were able to praise and thank the outstanding efforts of Tom Frericks as secretary-treasurer and Executive Director Dick Schultz. I submit now it is time for us to thank you (President Bailey) for your unselfish service to the NCAA. You have amazed all of us who have worked closely with you over the years with your energy and your dedication. Wil, you leave it better than you found it. You have done a great job. (Applause).

President Bailey: Thank you very, very much. I will make my comments extremely brief. It would be insensitive on my part to impose on your time. I am deeply grateful for the cooperation and support I have received from the membership, from the officers, the Council, the Executive Committee, the entire staff. Indeed, everyone with whom I have worked. I will simply quote a brief statement by Winston Churchill: "To every man there comes in his lifetime that special moment when he is figuratively tapped for the chance to do a very special thing."

You gave me that opportunity two years ago and I appreciate so very much your cooperation and support.

I call for Al Witte to come to the podium to transfer the gavel. (Applause) Congratulations, Al, and best wishes.

Albert M. Witte (University of Arkansas, Fayetteville): I follow two great men.

[The meeting was adjourned at 5:38 p.m.]

Appendix A

83rd Annual Convention LEGISLATIVE PROPOSALS

[Note: In the following proposals, those letters and words that appear in *italics* are to be deleted and those letters and words that appear in **bold face** are to be added. All proposed amendments shall be effective as indicated; the term "Immediately" means that the legislation, if adopted, becomes effective upon adjournment of the Convention. All page numbers listed refer to the corresponding pages in the NCAA Manual. All votes were by show of paddles unless otherwise indicated. *Only those proposed amendments upon which the 83rd annual Convention took some action appear in this appendix. Amendments to amendments immediately follow the proposal to which they relate.*]

TOPICAL GROUPINGS OF PROPOSED AMENDMENTS 83rd ANNUAL CONVENTION

<i>Proposal Numbers</i>	<i>General Topic</i>
1 through 9	Consent-Constitution
10 through 34	Consent-Bylaws
35 through 38	Consent-Deregulation/Simplification
39 through 48	Presidents Commission Grouping
49 through 55	Academics
56 through 68	Financial Aid
69 through 81	General
82 through 103	Recruiting
104 through 108	Championships and Extra Events
109 through 121	Eligibility
122 through 125	Membership and Classification
126 through 142	Playing Seasons
143 through 147	Deregulation/Simplification

Consent Package-Constitution

Proposals 1 through 9 are offered as a "consent package" of constitutional amendments considered to be noncontroversial or "house-keeping" in nature. Any objection from an active or voting conference member to any item contained in this package will remove that item for a separate vote. The remainder of the package will be acted upon with a single vote, requiring a two-thirds majority approval for adoption.

NO. 1 CHAMPIONSHIPS-PROMOTIONAL POSTERS

Constitution: Amend Article 3, Section 1-(e), by adding new paragraph (6), page 12, as follows:

[All divisions, common vote]

"(6) It is permissible for a student-athlete's name or picture to appear in a poster that promotes an NCAA championship, provided the poster is produced by a member institution that hosts a portion of the championship or by the NCAA."

Source: NCAA Council (Communications Committee).

Intent: To confirm that a student-athlete's name or picture may appear in a poster that promotes an NCAA championship, provided the poster is produced by a member institution that hosts a portion of the championship or by the NCAA.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: Nos. 1 through 5 and 7 through 9 were approved as a constitution/special rules consent package.

NO. 2 TRANSPORTATION-SKIING PRACTICE

Constitution: Amend Article 3, Section 1-(h)-(1), page 15, as follows:

[All divisions, common vote]

"(1) Actual and necessary expenses on intercollegiate athletics trips, reasonable trips (within the state in which the member institution is located or a distance not to exceed 100 miles if outside that state) to practice sites other than those of the institution, or to transport a team a reasonable distance (not to exceed 100 miles) to an off-campus site for a postseason team award or recognition meeting; however, it shall be permissible to provide expenses when a team is accorded special recognition by the President of the United States or the governor or legislative body of the state in which the member institution is located. In the sports of men's and women's skiing, a member institution may transport a team to a practice site beyond 100 miles out of state if necessitated by weather conditions."

Source: NCAA Council (Men's and Women's Skiing Committee).

Intent: To permit a member institution to transport members of its men's and women's ski teams to a practice site beyond 100 miles out of state if necessitated by weather conditions.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: See No. 1.

NO. 3 PERMISSIBLE EXPENSES-EATING DISORDERS

Constitution: Amend Article 3, Section 1-(h)-(4), by adding new subparagraph (v), page 15, relettering subsequent subparagraphs, as follows:

A-2 _____ 1989 Convention Proceedings

[All divisions, common vote]

"(4) Identified benefits incidental to a student's participation in intercollegiate athletics that may be financed by the institution are:

[Subparagraphs (i) through (iv) unchanged.]

"(v) Counseling expenses related to the treatment of eating disorders;"

[Subparagraphs (v) through (vii), renumbered as (vi) through (viii), unchanged.]

Source: NCAA Council (Committee on Competitive Safeguards and Medical Aspects of Sports).

Intent: To permit member institutions to provide to student-athletes counseling expenses related to the treatment of eating disorders.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: See No. 1.

NO. 4 INCIDENTAL EXPENSES-SPOUSES

Constitution: Amend Article 3, Section 1-(h)-(7), page 16, as follows:

[All divisions, common vote]

"(7) Transportation and housing expenses for parents (or legal guardians) and the spouse of a student-athlete and for the student-athlete's teammates to be present in situations in which a student-athlete suffers a life-threatening injury or illness, or in the event of a student-athlete's death, to provide these expenses in conjunction with funeral arrangements."

Source: NCAA Council (Special Committee on Deregulation and Rules Simplification).

Intent: To confirm that a member institution may transport and house the spouse of a student-athlete when the student-athlete suffers a life-threatening injury or illness and may provide such expenses in conjunction with funeral arrangements in the event of a student-athlete's death.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: See No. 1.

NO. 5 OUTSIDE COMPETITION

Constitution: Amend Article 3, Section 9-(c)-(2), by adding new subparagraph (iv), page 28, as follows:

[All divisions, common vote]

"(2) The Council shall have the authority to waive this provision by a two-thirds majority of its members present and voting to permit student-athletes to participate in:

"(i) Official Pan American tryouts and competition;

"(ii) Officially recognized competition directly qualifying participants for final Olympic tryouts. or;

Legislative Proposals _____ A-3

"(iii) Official tryouts and competition involving national teams sponsored by the appropriate Group A member of the U.S. Olympic Committee (or, for student-athletes representing another nation, the equivalent organization of that nation, or, for student-athletes competing in a non-Olympic sport, the equivalent organization of that sport), or

"(iv) Officially recognized state and national multisport events sanctioned by the Council."

Source: NCAA Council (Special Committee on Deregulation and Rules Simplification).

Intent: To confirm that student-athletes in sports other than basketball may compete during the institution's intercollegiate season in officially recognized state and national multisport events sanctioned by the Council.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: See No. 1.

NO. 6 DRUG-TESTING CONSENT FORM

Constitution: Amend Article 3, Section 9-(g), page 28, as follows:

[All divisions, common vote]

"(g) The student-athlete annually, prior to participation in intercollegiate competition during *the* each academic year in question, shall sign a statement in a form prescribed by the NCAA Council in which the student-athlete submits information related to eligibility, recruitment, financial aid, amateur status and involvement in organized gambling activities concerning intercollegiate athletics competition under the governing legislation of this Association, and in which the student reviews general information concerning postseason drug-testing awareness. The student-athlete also shall consents in writing in a form prescribed by the NCAA Council to be tested for the use of drugs prohibited by NCAA legislation. Failure to complete and sign the statement attesting to eligibility under NCAA legislation and affirming awareness of the postseason drug-testing program annually shall result in the student-athlete's ineligibility for participation in all intercollegiate competition for that year. Failure to sign the drug-testing consent form shall result in the student-athlete's ineligibility for participation in postseason competition for that year."

Source: NCAA Council (Executive Committee).

Intent: To administer the student-athlete drug-testing consent form separately from the student-athlete statement, to include general information regarding postseason drug-testing awareness in the latter document, to specify that failure to sign the statement attesting to eligibility under NCAA legislation and affirming awareness of the postseason drug-testing program shall result in the student-athlete's ineligibility for participation in all intercol-

legiate competition for that year, and to specify that failure to sign the drug-testing consent form shall result in the student-athlete's ineligibility for participation in postseason competition for that year.

Effective Date: August 1, 1989.

Action: Defeated 365-291 after being removed from the consent package (two-thirds majority required).

NO. 7 MEMBERSHIP

Constitution: Amend O.I. 12, following Constitution 4-2-(a), pages 30-31, as follows:

[All divisions, common vote]

"O.I. 12. The constitution, bylaws and other legislation of this Association, unless otherwise specified therein, shall apply to all sports recognized by the member institution as varsity intercollegiate sports and that involve all-male teams, mixed teams of males and females, and all-female teams. To be so recognized, a sport shall be one in which the Association conducts championships or for which it is responsible for providing playing rules for intercollegiate competition, which officially has been accorded varsity status by the institution's chief executive officer or committee responsible for intercollegiate athletics policy, which is administered by the department of intercollegiate athletics, for which the eligibility of the student-athletes is reviewed and certified by a staff member designated by the institution's chief executive officer or committee responsible for intercollegiate athletics policy, and in which qualified participants receive the institution's official varsity awards."

Source: NCAA Council (Special Committee on Deregulation and Rules Simplification).

Intent: To affirm that NCAA legislation applies only to sports in which the Association conducts championships.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: See No. 1.

NO. 8 TERMINATION OR SUSPENSION OF AFFILIATED OR CORRESPONDING MEMBERSHIP

Constitution: Amend Article 4, Section 6-(c), by adding new subparagraph (1), page 34, renumbering subsequent subparagraphs, as follows:

[All divisions, common vote]

"(1) The Council, by a two-thirds vote of its members present and voting, may take such action on its own initiative."

Source: NCAA Council.

Intent: To authorize the Council to terminate or suspend the mem-

bership of any affiliated or corresponding member on its own initiative.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: See No. 1.

NO. 9 COUNCIL AND EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE ELIGIBILITY

A. Constitution: Amend Article 5, Section 1-(a)-(6), page 38, as follows:

[All divisions, common vote]

"(6) To be eligible to serve on the Council, an individual currently shall be serving a member institution as (i) chief executive officer, or (ii) faculty athletics representative, or (iii) director of athletics, or (iv) *primary* **senior** woman administrator of athletics programs, or (v) **a full-time athletics administrator who is a member of an ethnic minority, or serving a member conference as (i) its full-time, salaried executive officer; (ii) senior woman administrator, or (iii) a full-time athletics administrator who is a member of an ethnic minority, and otherwise shall meet the provisions specified in O.I. 1200. If a Council member's status is altered to the extent that the individual no longer meets these requirements, the individual shall be replaced on the Council at the time of the next Convention.**"

B. Constitution: Amend Article 5, Section 2-(a)-(5), page 40, as follows:

[All divisions, common vote]

"(5) To be eligible to serve on the Executive Committee, an individual currently shall be serving a member institution as (i) chief executive officer, or (ii) faculty athletics representative, or (iii) director of athletics, or (iv) *primary* **senior** woman administrator of athletics programs, or (v) **a full-time athletics administrator who is a member of an ethnic minority, or serving a member conference as (i) its full-time, salaried executive officer; (ii) senior woman administrator, or (iii) a full-time athletics administrator who is a member of an ethnic minority, and otherwise shall meet the provisions specified in O.I. 1200. If an Executive Committee member's status is altered to the extent that the individual no longer meets these requirements, the individual shall be replaced on the Executive Committee at the time of the next annual Convention.**"

Source: NCAA Council (Executive Committee, Committee on Women's Athletics and Special Council Subcommittee to Review Minority Opportunities in Intercollegiate Athletics).

Intent: To permit a member conference's full-time salaried senior woman administrator who does not serve as its executive officer and a member institution's or member conference's full-time athletics administrator who is a member of an ethnic minority to serve on the Council and the Executive Committee.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: See No. 1.

Consent Package-Bylaws

Proposals 10 through 34 are offered as a "consent package" of bylaws amendments considered to be noncontroversial or "house-keeping" in nature. Any objection from an active or voting conference member to any item contained in this package will remove that item for a separate vote. The remainder of the package will be acted upon by a single vote, with a majority vote required for approval.

NO. 10 PRINTED RECRUITING AIDS-DIVISION III

Bylaws: Amend Article 1, Section 1-(b)-(4), page 57, as follows:

[Division III only]

"(4) Institutions in Division III are permitted to provide only the following printed materials to prospective student-athletes: official academic, admissions, athletics and student-services publications published by the institution and **other information of a general nature that is available to all students.**"

Source: NCAA Council (Division III Steering Committee).

Intent: To clarify that Division III member institutions are permitted to provide to prospective student-athletes information of a general nature that is available to all students.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: Nos. 10 through 15, 17 through 20, 22 through 23, 25 through 29 and 31 through 34 were approved as a bylaws and other legislation consent package.

NO. 11 OFFICIAL VISIT-NUMERICAL LIMITATION

Bylaws: Amend O.I. 106, following Article 1, Section 9-(e), page 72, as follows:

[All divisions, common vote]

"O.I. 106. The limitations on total visits set forth in Bylaw 1-9 apply separately to the period in which the prospective student-athlete is in high school and to the period beginning *with the prospect's enrollment in a college preparatory school or junior college* **September 1 following the prospect's completion of high school.**"

Source: NCAA Council (Legislation and Interpretations Committee).

Intent: To confirm that the limitations on total visits set forth in Bylaw 1-9 apply separately to the period in which the prospective student-athlete is in high school and to the period beginning September 1 following the prospect's completion of high school.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: See No. 10.

NO. 12 POSTSEASON BOWL GAMES

Bylaws: Amend Article 2, Section 2-(k) and (l), pages 78-79, as follows:

[Divided bylaw, Divisions I-A, I-AA and III football only, divided vote]

"(k) During the period of August 1 to the conclusion of its football game on the Saturday following the third Tuesday in November or 6 p.m. local time, whichever is earlier, a representative of a member institution, including its administrators, faculty, athletics staff members, conference officials, representatives of its athletics interests or student-athletes:

"(1) Shall not *consider* **accept formally** any *formal or informal* invitations, *directly or indirectly*, from any official or unofficial representative or agent of a certified postseason football game.

[Subparagraphs (2) and (3) unchanged.]

"(l) During the period of August 1 to the conclusion of a member institution's football game on the Saturday following the third Tuesday in November or 6 p.m. local time, whichever is earlier, any official or unofficial representative or agent of a certified postseason football game:

"(1) Shall not extend **formally** an invitation, *directly or indirectly*, to a representative of a member institution, including its administrators, faculty, athletics staff members, conference officials, representatives of its athletics interests or student-athletes, to participate in its game."

[Subparagraphs (2) and (3) unchanged.]

Source: NCAA Council (Special Events Committee).

Intent: To prohibit during the periods set forth in the legislation the formal offer or formal acceptance of invitations to participate in postseason football bowl games.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: See No. 10, moot for Division III due to approval of No. 108.

NO. 13 DECLARATION OF PLAYING SEASON

Bylaws: Amend Article 3, Section 1-(b)-(1), page 84, as follows:

[Divided bylaw, all divisions, divided vote]

"(1) Declaration of an institution's playing season in each sport shall be on file in writing in the office of the director of athletics prior to the beginning of an institution's playing season in each sport. Changes in the declaration for a particular *segment in a sport may be made only prior to the beginning of that segment* **are permissible and also shall be filed in writing in the office of the institution's director of athletics.**"

Source: NCAA Council (Special Committee on Deregulation and Rules Simplification).

Intent: To permit a member institution to change its declared playing season for a particular sport, provided written documentation of the change is filed in the office of the institution's director of athletics.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: See No. 10.

NO. 14 PLAYING AND PRACTICE SEASONS

Bylaws: Amend Article 3, Section 1-(k), page 87, as follows:

[Divided bylaw, all divisions, divided vote]

"(k) It shall be permissible to administer medical examinations at any time to enrolled student-athletes or to prospective student-athletes who either have signed the National Letter of Intent with the involved institution or have been accepted for enrollment in a regular full-time program of studies at that institution, provided the prospects visit the institution at their own expense for this purpose. In all divisions, it shall be permissible to designate a single date for issuing equipment and taking squad pictures following the beginning of classes in the fall term or the day prior to the beginning of a traditional or nontraditional segment as specified in Bylaw 3-1."

Source: NCAA Council (Special Committee on Deregulation and Rules Simplification).

Intent: To confirm that a member institution may designate a single date for issuing equipment and taking squad pictures prior to the beginning of a nontraditional segment if that date precedes the beginning of classes in the fall term.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: See No. 10.

NO. 15 PLAYING AND PRACTICE SEASONS

Bylaws: Amend Article 3, Section 1-(k), page 87, as follows:

[Divided bylaw, all divisions, divided vote]

"(k) It shall be permissible to administer medical examinations at any time to enrolled student-athletes or to prospective student-athletes who either have signed the National Letter of Intent with the involved institution or have been accepted for enrollment in a regular full-time program of studies at that institution, provided the prospects visit the institution at their own expense for this purpose. In all divisions, it shall be permissible to designate a single date for issuing equipment and taking squad pictures following the beginning of classes in the fall term or the day prior to the beginning of a traditional segment as specified in Bylaw 3-1. **If the day prior to the beginning of a traditional segment as specified in Bylaw 3-1 is a Sunday, the member institution may designate the preceding Saturday for issuing equipment and taking squad pictures.**"

Source: NCAA Council (Legislation and Interpretations Committee).

Intent: To confirm that if the day prior to the beginning of a traditional segment as specified in Bylaw 3-1 is a Sunday, the member institution may designate the preceding Saturday for issuing equipment and taking squad pictures.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: See No. 10.

NO. 16 PLAYING SEASON-FOOTBALL

Bylaws: Amend Article 3, Section 2, by deleting subparagraphs (i) and (iii) of paragraph (b)-(2), page 87, and adding new paragraph (d), page 88, relettering subsequent paragraphs, as follows:

[Divided bylaw, Divisions I-A, I-AA, II and III
football only, divided vote]

"(d) The last contest (game or scrimmage) in the sport of football shall not be played outside the traditional segment or after the second Saturday or Sunday in December, exclusive of the following:

"(1) One scrimmage or contest at the conclusion of spring practice, provided the game is with a team composed of bona fide alumni or students or both, and

"(2) One postseason game approved by the Postseason Football Subcommittee of the Special Events Committee or those games played in the National Collegiate Division I-AA, Division II and Division III Football Championships; international competition approved by the NCAA Council (by a two-thirds majority of its members present and voting), or the National Association of Intercollegiate Athletics football championships.

"(3) The certified postseason football game in (2) above must be played not later than the January 1 immediately following the conclusion of the regular football season or, if January 1 falls on a Friday or Sunday, not later than January 2 of that year."

Source: NCAA Council.

Intent: To establish a deadline for the completion of the last contest or scrimmage in the football playing season.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: Approved by all divisions as amended by No. 16-1, after being removed from the consent package.

NO. 16-1 PLAYING SEASON-FOOTBALL

Amend Proposal No. 16, Bylaw 3-2-(d), page 9, as follows:

A-10 _____ 1989 Convention Proceedings

[Divided bylaw, Divisions I-A, I-AA, II and III
football only, divided vote]

"(d) The last contest (game or scrimmage) in the sport of football shall not be played outside the traditional segment or after the second Saturday or Sunday in December, exclusive of the following:

"(1) One scrimmage or contest at the conclusion of spring practice, provided the game is with a team composed of bona fide alumni or students or both, and

"(2) One postseason game approved by the Postseason Football Subcommittee of the Special Events Committee or those games played in the National Collegiate Division I-AA, Division II and Division III Football Championships; international competition approved by the NCAA Council (by a two-thirds majority of its members present and voting), or the National Association of Intercollegiate Athletics football championships.

"(3) The certified postseason football game in (2) above must be played not later than the January 1 2 immediately following the conclusion of the regular football season or, if January 1 2 falls on a Friday or Sunday, not later than January 2 3 of that year."

Source: All 10 members of the Pacific-10 Conference.

Action: Approved by all divisions.

NO. 17 TRANSFER ELIGIBILITY-EXCHANGE STUDENT

Bylaws: Amend Article 5, Section 1-(m)-(4), page 115, as follows:

[Divided bylaw, all divisions, divided vote]

"(4) If the NCAA Eligibility Committee concludes that the student is to be enrolled in the certifying institution for a specified period of time as a bona fide exchange student participating in a formal educational exchange program that is an established requirement of the student-athlete's curriculum."

Source: NCAA Council (Eligibility Committee).

Intent: To permit the applicable member institution, rather than the Eligibility Committee, to administer the transfer eligibility waiver for a bona fide exchange student.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: See No. 10.

NO. 18 JUNIOR COLLEGE TRANSFER ELIGIBILITY-DROPPED SPORT

Bylaws: Amend Article 5, Section 1-(n)-(1), page 117, as follows:

[Divided bylaw, all divisions, divided vote]

"(1) If the NCAA Eligibility Committee concludes that the student changed institutions in order to continue participation in a sport
Legislative Proposals _____ A-11

because the student's original junior college dropped the sport from its intercollegiate program or never sponsored the sport on the intercollegiate level while the student was in attendance at that institution, provided the student never attended any other collegiate institution that offered intercollegiate competition in that particular sport and provided the student earned at least a minimum 2.000 grade-point average at the junior college."

Source: NCAA Council (Eligibility Committee).

Intent: To permit the applicable member institution, rather than the Eligibility Committee, to administer the transfer eligibility waiver for a junior college transfer student whose junior college dropped the sport or never sponsored the sport while the student was in attendance.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: See No. 10.

NO. 19 INITIAL ELIGIBILITY-REQUIRED TEST SCORE

Bylaws: Amend Article 5, Section 6-(b)-(1), page 123, as follows:
[Divided bylaw, Divisions I and II, divided vote]

"(1) If a student reports for practice or competition before a high school **core-curriculum** grade-point average or **standardized-test score** has been certified, the student may practice but not compete for a maximum of two weeks. After this two-week period, the student shall have an established minimum high school **core-curriculum** grade-point average and **standardized-test score** per Bylaw 5-1-(j) to continue practicing or to compete."

Source: NCAA Council (Academic Requirements Committee).

Intent: To confirm that a two-week grace period for practice exists for a student who reports for practice before a high school core-curriculum grade-point average or standardized-test score has been certified.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: See No. 10.

NO. 20 INSTITUTIONAL ELIGIBILITY

Bylaws: Amend Article 5, Section 6-(c), pages 123-124, as follows:
[Divided bylaw, all divisions, divided vote]

"(c) A Division I institution that has not operated in conformity for a period of two years with the requirements of Bylaw 5-6-(b) at the time it certifies conformance with the regulation shall be ineligible for NCAA championships and appearances on any television programs subject to the Association's control or administration until it can show conformity for a period of two years. A Division II or Division III institution petitioning for Division I institutional membership or eligibility in one sport (in accordance with Bylaws 10-3 and 10-4) shall have operated in conformity with

the requirements of Bylaw 5-6-(b) for two years preceding the effective date of its Division I membership or be ineligible for Division I championships and any television programs subject to the Association's control or administration until it can show conformity for a period of two years."

Source: NCAA Council (Special Committee on Deregulation and Rules Simplification).

Intent: To delete the reference to institutional ineligibility for non-championship television appearances for failure to comply with Bylaw 5-6-(b) inasmuch as the Association no longer administers a football television plan.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: See No. 10.

NO. 21 SPORTS SPONSORSHIP-DIVISIONS I AND III

A. Bylaws: Amend Article 11, Section 1-(b), page 155, as follows:
[Division I only]

"(b) An institution desiring to be a member of Division I shall sponsor a minimum of six varsity intercollegiate sports, including at least two team sports, involving all-male teams or mixed teams of males and females in Division I and six varsity intercollegiate sports, including at least two team sports, involving all-female teams in Division I. Such sponsorship shall be based on Section 4 of this article. **Institutions that sponsor and conduct athletics programs for only one sex need not meet the minimum sports sponsorship criterion for the other sex.**"

B. Bylaws: Amend Article 11, Section 3-(b), page 163, as follows:
[Division III only]

"(b) Beginning with the 1987-88 academic year, an **An** institution desiring to be a member of Division III shall sponsor a minimum of four varsity intercollegiate sports, including at least two team sports, involving all-male teams or mixed teams of males and females in Division III and a minimum of four varsity intercollegiate sports, including at least two team sports, involving all-female teams in Division III, except when a waiver has been granted per Constitution 4-2-(h)-(2). Such sponsorship shall be based on the provisions of Section 4 of this article. **Institutions that sponsor and conduct athletics programs for only one sex need not meet the minimum sports sponsorship criterion for the other sex.**"

Source: NCAA Council (Special Committee on Deregulation and Rules Simplification).

Intent: To specify that single-sex member institutions in Divisions I and III that sponsor and conduct athletics programs for only one sex need not meet the minimum sports sponsorship criterion for the other sex.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: Withdrawn.

NO. 22 SPORTS SPONSORSHIP-DIVISION II

Bylaws: Amend Article 11, Section 2-(b)-(1), page 159, as follows:

[Division II only]

"(1) One of the two team sports utilized to meet the requirement for all-male teams or mixed teams of males and females **or may be sponsored in Division I and one of the two team sports utilized to meet the sponsorship requirement for all-female teams may be sponsored in Division I.**"

Source: NCAA Council (Special Committee on Deregulation and Rules Simplification).

Intent: To confirm that a Division II member institution may sponsor in Division I one of the two team sports utilized to meet sports sponsorship requirements for all-male teams or mixed teams of males and females and one of the two team sports utilized to meet the sponsorship requirements for all-female teams.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: See No. 10.

NO. 23 ANNUAL FINANCIAL AUDIT-DIVISION III

Bylaws: Amend Article 11, Section 3-(c), page 163, as follows:

[Division III only]

"(c) All expenditures and revenue for or in behalf of a Division III member institution's intercollegiate athletics programs shall be subject to the institution's regular *annual* financial audit. In particular, additional revenue and expenditures associated with outside groups or individuals shall be included in this audit."

Source: NCAA Council (Division III Steering Committee).

Intent: To confirm that all expenditures and revenue for or in behalf of a Division III member institution's athletics programs are subject to the institution's regular financial audit, which need not be conducted on an annual basis.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: See No. 10.

NO. 24 SPORTS SPONSORSHIP CRITERIA

Bylaws: Amend Article 11, Section 4-(b)-(7), page 166, as follows:

[Divided bylaw, all divisions, divided vote]

"(7) The Council, by a two-thirds majority of its members present and voting, may approve a request from a member institution to designate one sport **involving all-male teams or mixed teams of males and females and one sport involving all-female teams** other than those in which the Association

sponsors a championship meet or tournament for the purpose of meeting the sports sponsorship criteria in Bylaw 11-1, Bylaw 11-2 or Bylaw 11-3."

Source: NCAA Council (Special Committee on Deregulation and Rules Simplification).

Intent: To confirm that the Council may approve a request from a member institution to designate one non-NCAA sport involving all-male teams or mixed teams of males and females and one non-NCAA sport involving all-female teams for the purpose of meeting the sports sponsorship criteria in Bylaw 11-1, Bylaw 11-2 or Bylaw 11-3.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: Approved by all divisions after being removed from the consent package.

NO. 25 CREDENTIALS COMMITTEE

Bylaws: Amend Article 12, Section 2-(c), page 168, as follows:

[Common bylaw, all divisions, divided vote]

"(c) The Credentials Committee shall be **composed of three members** appointed prior to the business sessions of each Convention. **One committee member shall be selected from each membership division.** It shall have the authority to examine the credentials of delegates to the Convention and to determine, subject to appeal to the Convention, the authority of any delegate to vote or otherwise represent a member at the Convention."

Source: NCAA Council (Special Committee on Deregulation and Rules Simplification).

Intent: To confirm that the Credentials Committee shall consist of three members and one committee member shall be selected from each membership division.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: See No. 10.

NO. 26 MEMORIAL RESOLUTIONS COMMITTEE

Bylaws: Amend Article 12, Section 2-(d), page 169, as follows:

[Common bylaw, all divisions, divided vote]

"(d) The Memorial Resolutions Committee shall be **composed of three members and shall be responsible for compiling the names of those individuals associated with intercollegiate athletics who died during the year immediately preceding the annual Convention. One committee member shall be selected from each membership division.** The committee shall make its report each year, memorializing the individuals involved, during the business sessions of the annual Convention."

Source: NCAA Council (Special Committee on Deregulation and Legislative Proposals)

Rules Simplification).

Intent: To confirm that the Memorial Resolutions Committee shall consist of three members and one committee member shall be selected from each membership division.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: See No. 10.

NO. 27 BASKETBALL OFFICIATING COMMITTEE

Bylaws: Amend Article 12, Section 3, by adding new paragraph (c), page 171, relettering subsequent paragraphs, as follows:

[Common bylaw, all divisions, divided vote]

"(c) The Basketball Officiating Committee shall monitor the Division I men's and women's basketball officiating programs and shall consist of 12 members, including six individuals representing Division I men's basketball officiating interests and six individuals representing Division I women's basketball officiating interests. The six individuals representing Division I men's basketball officiating interests shall include two coaches, one conference commissioner, the chair of the Men's Basketball Rules Committee or his designated representative, a representative of the Division I Men's Basketball Committee and one member selected at large. The six individuals representing Division I women's basketball officiating interests shall include two coaches, one conference commissioner, the chair of the Women's Basketball Rules Committee or her designated representative, a representative of the Division I Women's Basketball Committee and one member selected at large."

Source: NCAA Council (Executive Committee).

Intent: To establish the NCAA Basketball Officiating Committee to monitor the Division I men's and women's basketball officiating programs. [Estimated annual cost to the Association: \$10,000.]

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: See No. 10.

NO. 28 ELIGIBILITY COMMITTEE

Bylaws: Amend Article 12, Section 3-(e), pages 171-172, as follows:

[Common bylaw, all divisions, divided vote]

"(e) The Eligibility Committee shall consist of 10 11 members, including four five from Division I and three each from Divisions II and III, with three committee members also being Council members. Three positions shall be allocated for men, three allocated for women and four five unallocated."

[Subparagraphs (1) through (3) unchanged.]

Source: NCAA Council (Eligibility Committee).

Intent: To increase the membership of the Eligibility Committee from 10 to 11 by adding a Division I representative.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: See No. 10.

NO. 29 SPECIAL EVENTS COMMITTEE

Bylaws: Amend Article 12, Section 3-(q), page 174, as follows:

[Common bylaw, all divisions, divided vote]

"(q) The Special Events Committee shall consist of 13 12 members, including at least eight representatives of Division I-A, at least one of them from each NCAA district except District 1, and five four additional members. The five additional members shall include one representative of high school interests recommended by the executive director of the National Federation of State High School Associations. The committee shall include at least two women. The eight Division I-A representatives shall act as a subcommittee on postseason football matters, with its duties and functions set forth in Bylaws 2-1 and 2-2. The full committee shall act on issues involving extra events, as set forth in Bylaws 2-1 and 2-3."

Source: NCAA Council (Special Events Committee).

Intent: To reduce the membership of the Special Events Committee from 13 to 12 by deleting the requirement that a committee member represent high school interests.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: See No. 10.

NO. 30 COMMITTEE ON WOMEN'S ATHLETICS

Bylaws: Amend Article 12, Section 3-(r), page 174, as follows:

[Common bylaw, all divisions, divided vote]

"(r) The Committee on Women's Athletics shall consist of 12 members, including six members from Division I, three members from Division II and three members from Division III. Four positions shall be allocated for men, four allocated for women and four unallocated; one member shall be an undergraduate student-athlete who is a varsity letter-winner. It shall study and make policy recommendations to the Council concerning opportunities for women in athletics at the institutional, conference and national levels, as well as other issues directly affecting women's athletics."

Source: NCAA Council (Committee on Women's Athletics).

Intent: To delete the requirement that one member of the Committee on Women's Athletics be an undergraduate student.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: Approved by all divisions after being removed from the consent package.

NO. 31 WOMEN'S BASKETBALL RULES COMMITTEE

A. Bylaws: Amend Article 12, Section 5-(a)-(4), page 176, as follows:

[Common bylaw, all divisions, divided vote]

"(4) The secretary-rules editor of each of the following committees may be reelected without restriction: Baseball, Men's Basketball Rules, **Women's Basketball Rules**, Men's Fencing, Football Rules, Men's Ice Hockey, Men's Lacrosse, Men's and Women's Rifle, Men's Soccer, Men's and Women's Swimming, Men's and Women's Track and Field, Men's Water Polo, and Wrestling. Except for the Men's Basketball Rules and Football Rules Committees, the secretary-rules editor shall be a nonvoting member of the committee."

B. Bylaws: Amend Article 12, Section 5-(d), page 177, as follows:

[Common bylaw, all divisions, divided vote]

"(d) The Women's Basketball Rules Committee shall consist of **12** members and shall be constituted as follows."

[Subparagraphs (1) through (3) unchanged.]

Source: NCAA Council (Women's Basketball Rules Committee).

Intent: To add a nonvoting secretary-rules editor who may be reelected without restriction to the Women's Basketball Rules Committee. [Estimated annual cost to the Association: \$860.]

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: See No. 10.

NO. 32. MEN'S AND WOMEN'S SKIING COMMITTEE

A. Bylaws: Amend Article 12, Section 5-(a)-(4), page 176, as follows:

[Common bylaw, all divisions, divided vote]

"(4) The secretary-rules editor of each of the following committees may be reelected without restriction: Baseball, Men's Basketball Rules, Men's Fencing, Football Rules, Men's Ice Hockey, Men's Lacrosse, Men's and Women's Rifle, **Men's and Women's Skiing**, Men's Soccer, Men's and Women's Swimming, Men's and Women's Track and Field, Men's Water Polo, and Wrestling. Except for the Men's Basketball Rules and Football Rules Committees, the secretary-rules editor shall be a nonvoting member of the committee."

B. Bylaws: Amend Article 12, Section 5-(j), page 178, as follows:

[Common bylaw, all divisions, divided vote]

"(j) The Men's and Women's Skiing Committee shall consist of **six seven** members. **and shall be constituted as follows:**

"(1) Two positions shall be allocated for men, two allocated for women and **two three** unallocated;

"(2) One member shall be selected from the West skiing region, two members shall be selected from the East skiing region **and**, three shall be selected at large. **and one** member shall be elected secretary-rules editor, **and**

A-18 _____ 1989 Convention Proceedings

"(3) Committee shall act as one body to formulate playing rules and determine general policies for the National Collegiate Men's and Women's Skiing Championships."

Source: NCAA Council (Men's and Women's Skiing Committee).

Intent: To add a nonvoting secretary-rules editor who may be reelected without restriction to the Men's and Women's Skiing Committee. [Estimated annual cost to the Association: \$860.]

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: See No. 10.

NO. 33 NCAA FIELD HOCKEY COMMITTEE

Bylaws: Amend Article 12, Section 6-(i), page 182, as follows:

[Common bylaw, all divisions, divided vote]

"(i) The Field Hockey Committee shall consist of 12 members, including six members from Division I, **three one** members from Division II, **and** three members from Division III **and two members elected at large**. Committee shall act as one body to determine general policies for Divisions I and III championships in field hockey, with division subcommittees composed of committee members from the respective divisions responsible for administering the respective division championships."

Source: NCAA Council (Field Hockey Committee).

Intent: To reduce the Division II membership of the NCAA Field Hockey Committee from three to one and to create two at-large committee positions.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: See No. 10.

NO. 34 WOMEN'S SOCCER COMMITTEE

Bylaws: Amend Article 12, Section 6-(q), page 183, as follows:

[Common bylaw, all divisions, divided vote]

"(q) The Women's Soccer Committee shall consist of **six 12** members, including **three six** members from Division I, **one three** members from Division II, **and one three** members from Division III **and one member elected at large**. **Committee shall act as one body to determine general policies for Divisions I, II and III women's championships in soccer, with division subcommittees composed of committee members from the respective divisions responsible for administering the respective division championships.**"

Source: NCAA Council (Women's Soccer Committee).

Intent: To increase the size of the Women's Soccer Committee from six to 12 members by increasing the Division I membership from three to six and increasing the Divisions II and III membership from one to three each; to eliminate the committee's at-large

Legislative Proposals _____ A-19

member, and to establish committee responsibilities consistent with those of other sports committees that are responsible for three championships. [Estimated annual cost to the Association: \$5,000.]

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: See No. 10.

Consent Package—Deregulation/ Rules Simplification

Proposals 35 through 38 are offered as a "consent package" of bylaws amendments for the proposed revision of the NCAA Manual, and they are presented in the format of that revision. They are considered to be noncontroversial or "housekeeping" in nature. At the direction of the Special Committee on Deregulation and Rules Simplification, each includes a statement of rationale, as well as intent. Any objection from an active or voting conference member to any item contained in this package will remove that item for a separate vote. The remainder of the package will be acted upon with a single vote, requiring a two-thirds majority approval for adoption inasmuch as one of the proposals derives from the constitution.

NO. 35 RECRUITING-TRYOUTS

Amend 13.11.3 by deleting 13.11.3.1 and 13.11.3.2, renumbering subsections, as follows:

[Divided bylaw, all divisions, divided vote]

"13.11.3 Tryout Waivers and Exceptions

"13.11.3.1 Council Approval Required. Waivers of 13.11.1 (tryout rule) may be approved by the Council, by a two-thirds majority of its members present and voting, as follows: B 1-6-(d)

[13.11.3.1.1 through 13.11.3.1.4.1, renumbered as 13.11.3.1 through 13.11.3.4.1, unchanged.]

"13.11.3.2 Council Approval Not Required"

[13.11.3.2.1 through 13.11.3.2.3, renumbered as 13.11.3.5 through 13.11.3.7, unchanged.]

Source: NCAA Council (Special Committee on Deregulation and Rules Simplification).

Intent: To eliminate the requirement of Council approval of tryout activities that are listed in this section.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Rationale: The activities set forth in this proposal currently require Council approval, but in fact are processed through the NCAA staff in a routine manner. The proposal would eliminate considerable unnecessary paperwork. An institution would remain responsible for ensuring that the activity meets NCAA requirements.

Action: Nos. 35, 36 and 38 approved as a deregulation/rules simplification consent package.

NO. 36 ELIGIBILITY BETWEEN TERMS

Amend 14.1.6 as follows:

[Divided bylaw, all divisions, divided vote]

"14.1.6 Eligibility Between Terms. To be eligible for competition that takes place between terms, the student-athlete shall:

"(a) Have been registered for the required minimum full-time load (see 14.1.5.2.2) at the conclusion of the term immediately preceding the date of competition, if the student is continuing enrollment, or

"(b) Be accepted for enrollment as a regular full-time student for the regular term immediately following. *if the student is entering the institution for the first time in that term or is returning after previous full-time enrollment in the same institution (other than during the term immediately preceding the date of competition).* (Also see 14.12.) B 5-1-(c), CB 279"

Source: NCAA Council (Special Committee on Deregulation and Rules Simplification).

Intent: To eliminate the difference in rules application among entering, continuing and returning students in determining a student-athlete's eligibility for competition that occurs between terms.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Rationale: It does not seem necessary to treat continuing students differently than returning or entering students in terms of eligibility for competition between terms.

Action: See No. 35.

NO. 37 EXTRA BENEFITS

Amend 16.12.2.3 as follows:

[All divisions, common vote]

"16.12.2.3 Other Prohibited Benefits. An institutional employee or representative of the institution's athletics interests may not provide a student-athlete with extra benefits or services, including, but not limited to: C 3-1-(g)-(5)

"(a) A loan of money; C 3-1-(g)-(5)-(iii)

"(b) A **guarantee payment** of bond; C 3-1-(g)-(5)-(iii)

"(c) The use of an automobile, or C 3-1-(g)-(5)-(iv)

"(d) Signing or cosigning a note with an outside agency to arrange a loan. C 3-1-(g)-(5)-(vii)"

Source: NCAA Council (Special Committee on Deregulation and Rules Simplification).

Intent: To permit an institutional employee or representative of the

institution's athletics interests to guarantee a bond for a student-athlete, while retaining the prohibition against payment of bond.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Rationale: By prohibiting the guarantee of bond, student-athletes are being deprived of a benefit often afforded other students (e.g., it is not uncommon for faculty members to guarantee bond for their students). The student-athlete would remain responsible for making the payment.

Action: Defeated after being removed from consent package.

NO. 38 FOREIGN TOURS

A. Amend 17.23 as follows:

[Divided bylaw, all divisions, divided vote]

"17.23 Foreign Tours

"17.23.1 *Sanctioned Institutional Tours.* A member institution may participate in competition in any sport on foreign tours sanctioned by the Council, by a two-thirds majority of its members present and voting, in accordance with procedures, **provided the conditions set forth under in 30.6 are met**, except for the following: B 3-3-(k), B 3-3-(l), B 3-6-(a), B 3-6-(b), B 3-6-(b)-(8)"

B. Amend 30.6 as follows:

[Divided bylaw, all divisions, divided vote]

"30.6 Foreign Tours and Competition.

"The Council may sanction **A member institution may participate in a foreign tours in any sport** (see 17.23), provided the conditions specified below are met: (New)

"30.6.1 *Date of Application.* Requests for Council sanction shall be made by the institution at least 30 days prior to the competition. The Council, by a two-thirds majority of its members present and voting, may approve exceptions to the 30-day requirement when circumstances warrant. B 3-6-(a)

"30.6.1 **Certification of Tour.** The institution must certify in writing that the conditions set forth in this section are met and must maintain the certification on file in the athletics department.

[30.6.2 through 30.6.4 unchanged.]

"30.6.4.1 **Additional Basketball Restriction.** In the sport of basketball, an institution may not engage in a sanctioned **an exempt** foreign tour in any academic year (or the summer immediately thereafter) in which the following circumstance applies:"

[30.6.4.1-(a) through 30.6.8 unchanged.]

Source: NCAA Council (Special Committee on Deregulation and Rules Simplification).

Intent: To eliminate the requirement of Council approval of foreign tours.

A-22 _____ 1989 Convention Proceedings

Effective Date: Immediately.

Rationale: Foreign tours currently require Council approval, but in fact are processed through the NCAA staff in a routine manner. The proposal would eliminate considerable paper work. An institution would remain responsible for ensuring that the foreign tour meets NCAA requirements.

Action: See No. 35.

Presidents Commission Grouping

[Note: The Presidents Commission has designated the following 10 proposals for placement at this point in the agenda.]

[Note: The Presidents Commission has designated the following Proposal No. 39 for a roll-call vote.]

NO. 39 FINANCIAL AID LIMITATIONS

A. Bylaws: Amend Article 6, Section 1-(a), page 129, as follows:

[Divided bylaw, all divisions, divided vote]

"Section 1. Amount of Financial Aid. (a) A student-athlete shall not be eligible to participate in intercollegiate athletics if he or she receives financial aid that exceeds the value of tuition and fees, room and board, and required course-related books **cost of attendance that normally is incurred by students enrolled in a comparable program at that institution or that exceeds the limitations set forth in this bylaw for the membership division of the institution the student attends, whichever is less.** For purposes of this legislation, the maximum cost of attendance that may be provided to a student-athlete consists of 'basic educational expenses' (i.e., tuition, fees and required course-related books); room and board, and transportation, supplies and personal expenses as set forth in the student financial aid budget established by each institution in conformity with the regulations for the administration of Federal financial aid for students generally. The awarding of financial aid to student-athletes that exceeds the value of 'basic educational expenses' and room and board shall be based upon the recipient's demonstrated financial need as determined by the institution's regular financial aid authorities in accordance with Congressional methodology. In no event shall the amount of a student-athlete's financial aid exceed the cost of attendance or the value of 'basic educational expenses' and room and board, plus \$1,600, whichever is less."

B. Bylaws: Amend Article 6, Section 1, by adding a new paragraph (b), page 129, relettering subsequent paragraphs, as follows:

[Divided bylaw, all divisions, divided vote]

"(b) A division or subdivision [as set forth in Bylaw 10-1-(a)] may adopt limitations in addition to those set forth in Bylaw 6-1-(a) on the maximum amount of finan-

Legislative Proposals _____ A-23

cial aid that may be awarded to a student-athlete. Such restrictions may be applied on a sport-by-sport basis and shall be limited to the following categories:

"(1) The maximum amount of financial aid permitted in accordance with Bylaw 6-1-(a), subject to the additional restriction that all financial aid that exceeds the value of basic educational expenses must be based upon the recipient's demonstrated financial need.

"(2) The maximum amount of financial aid permitted in accordance with Bylaw 6-1-(a), subject to the additional restriction that all financial aid must be based upon the recipient's demonstrated financial need.

"(3) The maximum amount of financial aid permitted in accordance with Bylaw 6-1-(b)-(2), subject to the additional restriction that athletics ability shall not be considered as a criterion in the formulation of the financial aid package."

- C. Bylaws: Amend Article 6, Section 1-(b)-(2), by deleting subparagraph (iv), pages 129-130, renumbering subsequent subparagraphs, as follows:

[Divided bylaw, all divisions, divided vote]

"(iv) Pell Grants, provided the overall grant total, combining financial aid based on athletic ability and other institutionally administered financial aid and the Pell Grant, does not exceed the value of tuition, fees, room and board, and required course-related books, plus \$1,400 in Division I institutions or \$900 in Division II and Division III institutions."

- D. Bylaws: Amend Article 6 by adding new Section 2, page 130, renumbering subsequent sections, as follows:

[Division I only]

"Section 6-2. Division Limitations. (a) In Division I, the maximum amount of financial aid that a student-athlete is permitted to receive shall be subject to the restrictions set forth in Bylaw 6-1-(b)-(1) for student-athletes participating in all sports other than football, men's and women's basketball, and not more than two additional women's sports determined by each member institution."

- E. Bylaws: Amend Article 6 by adding new Section 2, page 130, renumbering subsequent sections, as follows:

[Division II only]

"Section 6-2. Division Limitations. (a) In Division II, the maximum amount of financial aid that a student-athlete is permitted to receive shall be subject to the restrictions set forth in Bylaw 6-1-(b)-(1) for student-athletes participating in all sports other than football, men's and women's basketball, and not more than two additional women's sports determined by each member institution."

- F. Bylaws: Amend Article 6 by adding new Section 2, page 130, renumbering subsequent sections, as follows:

[Division III only]

"Section 6-2. Division Limitations. (a) In Division III, the maximum amount of financial aid that a student-athlete is permitted to receive shall be subject to the restrictions set forth in Bylaws 6-1-(b)-(3) and 11-3-(a) for all sports."

- G. Bylaws: Amend Article 6, Section 5-(i), page 135, as follows:

[Divided bylaw, all divisions, divided vote]

"(i) With respect to sports other than men's and women's basketball, women's gymnastics, women's tennis, and women's volleyball in Division I; football in Division I-A, and the total maximum awards limitation in football in Division I-AA, and with respect to all sports in Division II, a member institution may administer such awards to any number of recipients on the basis of value (equivalency) so long as the total dollar amount expended, **excluding all need-based awards received by individuals that exceed the maximum amount of financial aid permitted without consideration of the recipient's need, does not exceed a base budget defined as the value of 'commonly accepted educational expenses' the product of the maximum individual award permitted without consideration of the recipient's need at that institution multiplied by the number of maximum awards permitted for the particular sport in its division.** The following computational method shall be utilized in administering this procedure:

"(1) The institution shall count the actual amount of money financial aid a student-athlete is awarded or receives for room, board, tuition and fees as well as books (which may not exceed \$200 per academic year) **up to but not exceeding the maximum amount of financial aid permitted without consideration of the recipient's need.**

"(2) The actual amount the student-athlete receives that is counted in accordance with subparagraph (1) in ratio to the actual total maximum amount the student-athlete could receive for each item listed herein **without consideration of demonstrated financial need** shall represent a fraction of the maximum award utilized.

"(3) The sum of all fractional and maximum awards received by student-athletes shall not exceed the total limit each year in the sport in question."

- H. Bylaws: Amend Article 10, Section 1-(a), page 147, as follows:

[Common bylaw, all divisions, divided vote]

"Section 1. Determination of Divisions. (a) Each active member institution shall be designated as a member of Division I, Division II or Division III for certain legislative and competitive purposes. The Council, by a two-thirds majority of its members present and voting, may permit an institution's women's athletic Legislative Proposals _____ A-25

ics program to be classified in a division other than its membership division if it deems that unusual circumstances warrant such action. *In the sport of football only*, Division I shall be divided into Division I-A, and Division I-AA and Division I-AAA (which shall include Division I member institutions not competing in the sport of football in Division I), and the membership of these subdivisions Divisions I-A and I-AA shall vote separately on legislative issues that pertain only to the sport of football. In addition, the membership of Division I-A and the remainder of the membership of Division I each subdivision of Division I may vote separately on any issue in those bylaws that may be amended by a division acting separately, with the exception of Bylaws 5-6, 5-7, 6-1, 6-5(e), 7-1(b) and other Bylaw 7 legislation pertaining to basketball, 11-1(a) through (g), and 11-4."

I. Bylaws: Amend Article 10, Section 3-(c), page 151, as follows:

[Common bylaw, all divisions, divided vote]

"(c) A member institution classified in Division II or Division III that also is classified and participates in Division I ice hockey shall be permitted to vote on legislative issues directly affecting ice hockey at the Division I level. A member institution shall be permitted to vote on legislative issues directly affecting only a particular sport in the division in which the institution is classified in that sport."

Source: NCAA Presidents Commission.

Intent: To establish need-based financial aid restrictions in Divisions I and II, in all sports other than football, men's and women's basketball, and not more than two additional women's sports determined by each institution, for student-athletes receiving financial aid that exceeds the value of "basic educational expenses" (i.e., tuition and fees and required course-related books); to establish need-based financial aid restrictions in Divisions I and II in the sports of football, men's and women's basketball, and not more than two additional women's sports determined by each institution for student-athletes receiving financial aid that exceeds the value "basic educational expenses" and room and board; to establish that the amount of financial aid that a student-athlete may receive shall not exceed the cost of attendance or the value of "basic educational expenses" and room and board, plus \$1,600, whichever is less.

Effective Date: August 1, 1990.

Action: Withdrawn; No. 39-1 offered as a substitute.

NO. 39-1 RESOLUTION: COST REDUCTION

[All divisions, common vote]

"Whereas, it is the sense of the Convention that some means must be found to reduce the costs of intercollegiate athletics and that this must be accomplished without denying students access to higher education or significantly altering the competitive balance among NCAA member institutions; and

"Whereas, there appears to be merit, at least for some sports in some divisions, in the concept of restricting athletics scholarships to basic educational expenses plus demonstrated need (as these concepts are defined in Proposal No. 39 withdrawn from the 1989 Convention; and

"Whereas, other strategies to reduce costs also deserve careful consideration;

"Now, Therefore, Be It Resolved, that a Special Committee on Cost Reduction be chaired and appointed by the outgoing NCAA president with the approval of the NCAA Council and Presidents Commission, comprising the following 17 additional members: a chief executive officer and an athletics director from each of Divisions I-A, I-AA, I-AAA, II and III; three senior women administrators of athletics; two financial aid professionals; and two faculty athletics representatives; with at least five of the 17 above being women and at least two belonging to ethnic minorities; and

"Be It Further Resolved, that this committee be charged with the preparation of legislative proposals for future NCAA Conventions through 1991 in response to concerns expressed in the above 'whereas clauses,' for sponsorship consideration by the NCAA Council, the Presidents Commission, or other qualified proponents; and

"Be It Finally Resolved, that this committee prepare written and oral reports for the 1990 NCAA Convention."

Source: NCAA Presidents Commission.

Action: Approved, 653-42, three abstentions, roll-call vote.

[Note: The Presidents Commission has designated the following Proposal No. 40 for a roll-call vote.]

NO. 40 PELL GRANTS

Bylaws: Amend Article 6, Section 1-(b)-(2)-(iv), pages 129-130, as follows:

[Divided bylaw, all divisions, divided vote]

"(iv) Pell Grants, provided the overall grant total, combining financial aid based on athletic ability and other institutionally administered financial aid and the Pell Grant, does not exceed the value of tuition, fees, room and board, and required course-related books, plus \$1,400 in Division I institutions or \$900 in Division II and Division III institutions the cost of attendance that normally is incurred by students enrolled in a comparable program at that institution."

Source: NCAA Council.

Intent: To permit a student-athlete who receives a Pell Grant, as well as institutionally administered financial assistance, to receive a maximum combined total amount that does not exceed the cost of attendance that normally is incurred by students enrolled in a comparable program at that institution.

Effective Date: August 1, 1989.

Action: Defeated by all divisions. Division I, 156-157, five abstentions.
Legislative Proposals _____ A-27

tions; later motion to reconsider defeated, 120-189, two abstentions. Division II, 30-133, one abstention. Division III, 105-114, five abstentions. All votes by roll call.

[Note: The Presidents Commission has designated the following Proposal No. 41 for a roll-call vote.]

NO. 41 PARTIAL QUALIFIER AND NONQUALIFIER

A. Bylaws: Amend Article 5, Section 1-(j)-(2), pages 105-106, as follows:

[Division I only]

"(2) An entering freshman with no previous college attendance who matriculated as a nonqualifier in a Division I institution and whose matriculation was solicited per O.I. 100 shall not be eligible for financial aid, regular-season competition and practice during the first academic year in residence, *except that a high school graduate who presents an overall accumulative minimum grade-point average of 2.000 but who fails to present the required grade-point average in the core curriculum and achieve the required test score may receive financial aid based upon institutional and conference regulations. A nonqualifier or partial qualifier shall be entitled to three seasons of eligibility per Bylaw 5-1-(d) subsequent to the initial year of residence at the certifying institution.*"

B. Bylaws: Amend Article 5, Section 1-(j)-(3), page 106, as follows:

[Division I only]

"(3) An entering freshman with no previous college attendance who matriculated as a nonqualifier in a Division I institution and whose matriculation was not solicited per O.I. 100 shall not be eligible for regular-season competition and practice during the first academic year in residence; however, such a student whose admission and financial aid were granted without regard in any degree to athletic ability shall be eligible for nonathletic financial aid, provided there is on file in the office of the director of athletics certification by the faculty representative, the admissions officer and the chair of the financial aid committee that admission and financial aid were so granted. *A nonqualifier or partial qualifier shall be entitled to three seasons of eligibility per Bylaw 5-1-(d) subsequent to the initial year of residence at the certifying institution.*"

Source: All eight members of the Colonial Athletic Association.

Intent: To modify Bylaw 5-1-(j) for Division I by eliminating the "partial qualifier" provision and restoring a season of eligibility to the nonqualifier.

Effective Date: August 1, 1989.

Action: Withdrawn.

[Note: The Presidents Commission has designated the following Proposal No. 42 for a roll-call vote.]

NO. 42 PARTIAL QUALIFIER

A. Bylaws: Amend Article 5, Section 1-(j)-(2), pages 105-106, as follows:

A-28 _____ 1989 Convention Proceedings

[Division I only]

"(2) An entering freshman with no previous college attendance who matriculated as a nonqualifier in a Division I institution and whose matriculation was solicited per O.I. 100 shall not be eligible for financial aid, regular-season competition and practice during the first academic year in residence, *except that a high school graduate who presents an overall accumulative minimum grade-point average of 2.000 but who fails to present the required grade-point average in the core curriculum and achieve the required test score may receive financial aid based upon institutional and conference regulations. A nonqualifier or partial qualifier shall be entitled to three seasons of eligibility per Bylaw 5-1-(d) subsequent to the initial year of residence at the certifying institution.*"

B. Bylaws: Amend Article 5, Section 1-(j)-(3), page 106, as follows:

[Division I only]

"(3) An entering freshman with no previous college attendance who matriculated as a nonqualifier in a Division I institution and whose matriculation was not solicited per O.I. 100 shall not be eligible for regular-season competition and practice during the first academic year in residence; however, such a student whose admission and financial aid were granted without regard in any degree to athletic ability shall be eligible for nonathletic financial aid, provided there is on file in the office of the director of athletics certification by the faculty representative, the admissions officer and the chair of the financial aid committee that admission and financial aid were so granted. *A nonqualifier or partial qualifier shall be entitled to three seasons of eligibility per Bylaw 5-1-(d) subsequent to the initial year of residence at the certifying institution.*"

Source: All 10 members of the Southeastern Conference.

Intent: To modify Bylaw 5-1-(j) for Division I by eliminating the "partial qualifier" provision.

Effective Date: August 1, 1990.

Action: Approved by Division I, 163-154, two abstentions. First defeated, 151-159, four abstentions; motion to reconsider approved, 175-137, three abstentions. All votes by roll call.

[Note: The Presidents Commission has designated the following Proposal No. 43 for a roll-call vote.]

NO. 43 ELIGIBILITY-PARTIAL QUALIFIER AND NONQUALIFIER

A. Bylaws: Amend Article 5, Section 1-(j)-(2), by adding new subparagraphs (i) and (ii), page 106, as follows:

[Division I only]

"(i) A fourth season of eligibility shall be granted to a nonqualifier or partial qualifier, provided, at the beginning of the fifth calendar year following the student-ath-

Legislative Proposals _____ A-29

lete's initial, full-time collegiate enrollment, the student-athlete has completed satisfactorily a minimum of 96 semester or 144 quarter units applicable toward a specific baccalaureate degree program at the certifying institution.

"(ii) This provision shall be administered by the member conferences of the Association or, in the case of an independent member institution, by the NCAA Academic Requirements Committee."

- B. Bylaws: Amend Article 5, Section 1-(j)-(3), by adding new subparagraphs (i) and (ii), page 106, as follows:

[Division I only]

"(i) A fourth season of eligibility shall be granted to a nonqualifier or partial qualifier, provided, at the beginning of the fifth calendar year following the student-athlete's initial, full-time collegiate enrollment, the student-athlete has completed satisfactorily a minimum of 96 semester or 144 quarter units applicable toward a specific baccalaureate degree program at the certifying institution.

"(ii) This provision shall be administered by the member conferences of the Association or, in the case of an independent member institution, by the NCAA Academic Requirements Committee."

Source: University of California, Irvine; University of California, Santa Barbara; California State University, Fresno; California State University, Fullerton; California State University, Long Beach; University of Hawaii, and five other members of the Big West Conference.

Intent: To permit nonqualifiers or partial qualifiers in Division I to earn a fourth season of athletics eligibility, provided they have completed 96 semester or 144 quarter units toward a specific baccalaureate degree program at the certifying institution by the beginning of the fifth calendar year following their initial, full-time collegiate enrollment.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: Defeated by Division I, as amended by No. 43-1, 135-179, two abstentions; roll-call vote.

NO. 43-1 ELIGIBILITY-PARTIAL QUALIFIER AND NONQUALIFIER

- A. Amend Proposal No. 43-A, Bylaw 5-1-(j)-(2)-(i), page 27, as follows:

[Division I only]

"(i) A fourth season of eligibility shall be granted to a nonqualifier or partial qualifier, provided, at the beginning of the fifth calendar academic year following the student-athlete's initial, full-time collegiate enrollment, the student-athlete has com-

A-30 _____ 1989 Convention Proceedings

pleted satisfactorily a minimum of 96 semester or 144 quarter units applicable toward a specific baccalaureate degree program at the certifying institution."

- B. Amend Proposal No. 43-B, Bylaw 5-1-(j)-(3)-(i), page 27, as follows:

[Division I only]

"(i) A fourth season of eligibility shall be granted to a nonqualifier or partial qualifier, provided, at the beginning of the fifth calendar academic year following the student-athlete's initial, full-time collegiate enrollment, the student-athlete has completed satisfactorily a minimum of 96 semester or 144 quarter units applicable toward a specific baccalaureate degree program at the certifying institution."

Source: All 12 members of the Big West Conference.

Action: Approved by Division I, 273-40, one abstention; roll-call vote.

[Note: The Presidents Commission has designated the following Proposal No. 44 for a roll-call vote.]

NO. 44 TRANSFER—JUNIOR COLLEGE NONQUALIFIER

- Bylaws: Amend Article 5, Section 1-(j)-(9), page 112, as follows:

[Division I only]

"(9) A transfer student from a junior college who was a nonqualifier is not eligible in Division I institutions for financial aid and practice, regular-season competition and for any NCAA championships the first academic year in residence unless the student has graduated from the junior college and has satisfactorily completed a minimum of 48 semester or 72 quarter hours of transferable degree credit acceptable toward any baccalaureate degree program at the certifying institution with a minimum accumulative grade-point average of 2.000. In addition, a transfer student from a junior college who was a nonqualifier is not eligible in Division I institutions for regular-season competition and for any NCAA championships until the student completes one academic year in residence at the certifying institution."

Source: University of Connecticut; DePaul University; University of Illinois, Champaign; Ohio State University; Pennsylvania State University; St. John's University (New York), and eight other member institutions.

Intent: To require a junior college transfer student who was a nonqualifier to complete one academic year in residence at the certifying institution, regardless of whether the student has fulfilled the eligibility requirements of Bylaw 5-1-(j)-(9) for financial aid and practice.

Effective Date: August 1, 1990.

Action: Defeated by Division I, 103-208, four abstentions; roll-call vote.

Legislative Proposals _____ A-31

[Note: The Presidents Commission has designated the following Proposal No. 45 for a roll-call vote.]

NO. 45 FINANCIAL AID PACKAGE-DIVISION III

A. Bylaws: Amend Article 11, Section 3-(a)-(6), page 162, as follows:

[Division III only]

"(6) The composition of the financial aid package offered to a student-athlete shall be consistent with the established policy of the institution's financial aid office for all students; *however, a member institution shall not consider athletic ability as a criterion in the formulation of the financial aid package.*"

B. Bylaws: Amend Case No. 416, page 439, relating to Bylaw 11-3-(a)-(6), as follows:

[Division III only]

"Situation: The composition of a financial aid package offered to a student-athlete by a Division III member institution shall be consistent with the established policy of the institution's financial aid office for all students.

"Question: May a Division III member institution offer a student-athlete a financial aid package that takes into account variables in the packaging formula other than need (e.g., academic ability, minority status, specialized interests in activities other than **including** athletics) so long as the package does not exceed the recipient's financial need?

"Answer: Yes. A financial aid package for a student-athlete may be considered consistent with the established financial aid packaging policy of the institution's financial aid office for all students if it is equivalent to individual packages for other students with similar need characteristics. *However, a member institution shall not consider athletic ability as a criterion in the formulation of the financial aid package.*"

Source: Brandeis University, Carnegie-Mellon University, University of Chicago, New York University, University of Rochester and Washington University (Missouri).

Intent: To permit a Division III member institution to consider athletic ability in the formulation of need-based financial aid packaging in a manner that is consistent with consideration given to similar abilities and interests of other students.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: Withdrawn.

[Note: The Presidents Commission has designated the following Proposal No. 46 for a roll-call vote.]

NO. 46 FINANCIAL AID PACKAGE-DIVISION III

A. Bylaws: Amend Article 11, Section 3-(a)-(6), page 162, as follows:

[Division III only]

A-32 _____ 1989 Convention Proceedings

"(6) The composition of the financial aid package offered to a student-athlete shall be consistent with the established policy of the institution's financial aid office for all students; *however, a member institution shall not consider athletic ability as a criterion in the formulation of the financial aid package in a manner that is not consistent with the treatment given to the distinctive abilities or interests of other students with similar need characteristics. If a member institution uses preferential, need-based financial aid packaging for students with distinctive abilities, the percentage of student-athletes receiving such need-based financial aid packages shall not exceed the percentage of all students receiving preferential, need-based financial aid packages. These percentages shall be based on the pool of financial aid applicants at the member institution who qualify for need-based financial aid under nationally recognized guidelines. Further, the percentage of need met, and the combination of grant and self-help included in the need-based financial aid package of a student-athlete, shall be closely equivalent to that of other members of the general student body with similar need characteristics and distinctive abilities.*"

B. Bylaws: Amend Case No. 416, page 439, relating to Bylaw 11-3-(a)-(6), as follows:

[Division III only]

"Situation: The composition of a financial aid package offered to a student-athlete by a Division III member institution shall be consistent with the established policy of the institution's financial aid office for all students.

"Question: May a Division III member institution offer a student-athlete a financial aid package that takes into account variables in the packaging formula other than need (e.g., academic ability, minority status, specialized interests in activities other than **including** athletics) so long as the package does not exceed the recipient's financial need?

"Answer: Yes. A financial aid package for a student-athlete may be considered consistent with the established financial aid packaging policy of the institution's financial aid office for all students if it is equivalent to individual packages for other students with similar need characteristics and distinctive abilities. However, a member institution shall not consider athletic ability as a criterion in the formulation of the financial aid package in a manner that is not consistent with the treatment given to the distinctive abilities or interests of other students with similar need characteristics."

Source: Alfred University, Brandeis University, Carnegie-Mellon University, Drew University, Hobart and William Smith Colleges, New York University, and four other member institutions.

Legislative Proposals _____ A-33

Intent: To permit a Division III member institution to consider, subject to certain percentage restrictions, athletic ability in the formulation of need-based financial aid packaging in a manner that is consistent with the consideration given to similar abilities and interests of other students.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: Defeated by Division III, 48-187; roll-call vote.

NO. 47 BIENNIAL LEGISLATIVE CALENDAR

A. Constitution: Amend Article 5, Section 7, pages 46-48, as follows:

[All divisions, common vote]

"Section 7. Meetings. (a) There shall be an annual Convention of this Association during the second week of January or such other time as may be prescribed by the Executive Committee.

"(1) The Association regularly shall utilize alternate annual Conventions to conduct voting on legislative matters on a biennial basis. Such voting Conventions shall be termed legislative Conventions.

"(2) During alternate, nonlegislative years, the annual Convention shall include forums and round-table discussions regarding issues affecting the interests of the various membership divisions. The Council and Presidents Commission may submit for the membership's consideration at such a Convention legislative matters clearly necessary to promote the normal and orderly administration of the Association's legislation. In addition, division business sessions may be conducted at such a Convention, provided any legislation passed during the sessions will not be effective until after the adjournment of the subsequent legislative Convention.

"(b) The Division I-A members of the Council, by a two-thirds majority vote, may schedule a legislative meeting of Division I-A during June or August, at which the Division I-A membership may adopt legislation applicable only to Division I-A and may propose legislation on other matters for consideration by the subsequent annual legislative Convention. Legislation adopted at the Division I-A legislative meeting shall become effective immediately upon adjournment of the subsequent annual legislative Convention, subject to the conditions of the special rules of order and subject to the rescission provisions of the bylaws [Bylaw 11-1-(k), Bylaw 13-1-(f) and O.I. 1300].

"(c) The Division I-AA members of the Council, by a two-thirds majority vote, may schedule a legislative meeting of Division I-AA during the summer, at which the Division I-AA membership may adopt legislation applicable only to Division I-AA and may propose legislation on other matters for considera-

tion by the subsequent annual legislative Convention. Legislation adopted at the Division I-AA legislative meeting shall become effective immediately upon adjournment of the subsequent annual legislative Convention, subject to the conditions of the special rules of order and subject to the rescission provisions of the bylaws [Bylaw 11-1-(k), Bylaw 13-1-(f) and O.I. 1300.]

[Paragraphs (d) through (h) unchanged.]

"(i) The rules contained in the current edition of Robert's Rules of Order, Newly Revised, shall be the parliamentary authority for the conduct of all meetings of the Association and shall be the deciding reference used in case of parliamentary challenge in all instances to which they apply and in which they are not superseded by this constitution, the bylaws or any special rule of order the Association may adopt.

"(1) Pursuant to Constitution 5-7-(a)-(1) and (2), the Association may adopt special rules of order not inconsistent with the constitution and bylaws by a two-thirds majority of the delegates present and voting at any annual or special Convention."

[Subparagraph (2) unchanged.]

B. Constitution: Amend Article 6, Section 1-(a), page 50, as follows:

[All divisions, common vote]

"Section 1. Bylaws. (a) Pursuant to Constitution 5-7-(a)-(1) and (2), the Association may at any annual or special Convention adopt or amend any bylaws not inconsistent with the provisions of the constitution by a majority vote of the members present and voting, except where a greater majority may be required by the bylaws. Bylaws may be adopted or amended by vote of a membership division within the Association as prescribed by the bylaws."

C. Constitution: Amend Article 6, Section 3-(b), page 51, as follows:

[All divisions, common vote]

"(b) The executive regulations may be amended at any annual or special Convention by a majority vote of the delegates present and voting in accordance with the procedures set forth in Constitution 5-7-(a)-(1) and (2) and Bylaws 13-1, 13-2 and 13-3, except for amendments sponsored by the Executive Committee, which shall observe the procedure set forth in Bylaw 13-4."

D. Constitution: Amend Article 6, Section 4, pages 51-52, as follows:

[All divisions, common vote]

"Section 4. Resolutions. Legislation may be enacted through resolutions not inconsistent with the constitution, bylaws, casebook interpretations, special rules of order, executive regulations, enforcement program and football television plan at any annual legislative or special Convention by a majority of the delegates present and voting, provided the legislation is of a tempo-

rary character effective only for the time specified in the resolution itself, and provided further that the proposed resolution shall have been submitted in writing to the *secretary* **NCAA national office** prior to *1 p.m. on the day* **the October 15** preceding the *division business sessions*, **biennial legislative Convention** except for those resolutions sponsored by the Council, which shall observe the procedure set forth in Bylaw 13-4.

"(a) If the resolution is not sponsored by the Council, the **Presidents Commission or a division steering committee**, it shall be sponsored by at least *six* **10** active members (not more than five of which may belong to the same member conference) and it shall be submitted in the name of each institution by the chief executive officer or the chief executive officer's designated representative."

[Paragraphs (b) through (d) unchanged.]

E. Constitution: Amend Article 6, Section 5, page 52, as follows:

[All divisions, common vote]

"Section 5. Administrative Regulations. Pursuant to **Constitution 5-7-(a)-(1) and (2)**, the Association may at any annual or special Convention adopt or amend any administrative regulation by a majority vote of the delegates present and voting."

F. Constitution: Amend Article 7, pages 53-54, as follows:

[All divisions, common vote]

"Section 1. (a) Pursuant to **Constitution 5-7-(a)-(1) and (2)**, this constitution may be amended at any annual or special Convention by a two-thirds majority of the delegates present and voting.

"(1) provided that the proposed **amendments proposed by the membership** shall have been submitted to the secretary of the Association by mail or wired transmission received at the NCAA national office not later than *November 1* **March 15** (any amendment received after that date must be postmarked not later than *October 25* **March 8**) preceding an annual **a legislative** Convention, or *60* **90** days preceding a special Convention. The Council, by a two-thirds majority of its members present and voting, may establish a later date for the submission of amendments for an annual **a legislative** Convention when a special Convention is held after *November 1* **March 15**.

"(2) **Amendments sponsored by the NCAA Council, a division steering committee or the Presidents Commission shall be submitted to the national office not later than August 15 preceding a legislative or nonlegislative Convention or 90 days preceding a special Convention. The Council, by a two-thirds majority of its members present and voting, may establish a later date for the submission of amendments for a legislative or nonlegislative Convention when a special**

Convention is held after August 15.

"(b) Except for those sponsored by the NCAA Council, a division steering committee or the Presidents Commission, each proposed amendment for a **legislative Convention** shall be sponsored by a total of *six* **10** active members (not more than five of which may belong to the same member conference), submitted in accordance with the deadlines for receipt of amendments. The amendment shall be submitted in the name of the institution by the chief executive officer or the chief executive officer's designated representative.

"(c) **Amendments proposed by the NCAA Council, a division steering committee or the Presidents Commission for a nonlegislative Convention shall be sponsored by 75 percent of the members (present and voting) of the applicable sponsoring group.**

[Paragraph (c), relettered as (d), unchanged.]

"Section 2. (a) **Not later than April 15 preceding a legislative Convention, the secretary shall publish in The NCAA News all proposed amendments submitted by the membership pursuant to Section 1 and all other proposals approved by the NCAA Council, a division steering committee or the Presidents Commission as of that date.**

"(b) **Not later than September 15 preceding a legislative or nonlegislative Convention, the secretary shall publish in The NCAA News all previously unpublished amendments submitted by the NCAA Council, a division steering committee or the Presidents Commission pursuant to Section 1.**

"(c) **Not later than 75 days preceding a special Convention, the secretary shall publish in The NCAA News all proposed amendments submitted by the membership pursuant to Section 1.**

"(d) The secretary shall mail a copy of the proposed amendments to all members of the Association not later than November 29 15 preceding an annual Convention, or 45 days preceding a special Convention. If the Council establishes a date later than *November 1* **March 15 or August 15** for the submission of amendments for an annual **a legislative** Convention in accordance with Constitution 7-1-(a)-(1) and (2), it, by a two-thirds majority of its members present and voting, may establish a later date for mailing a copy of the proposed amendments to the members.

"Section 3. A proposed amendment to the constitution may be amended at a Convention by a majority of the members present and voting, provided that the amendment to the proposed amendment does not increase the modification of the constitutional provision to be amended, and provided further that the amendment to the proposed amendment shall have been submitted in writing to the secretary prior to *1 p.m. on the day preceding the division business sessions* **not later than the October 15 preceding**

an annual Convention (any amendment received after that date must be postmarked not later than October 8) or 60 days preceding a special Convention and shall be sponsored by a total of 10 active member institutions (not more than five of which may belong to the same member conference). The secretary shall prepare copies of the amendments to the proposed amendments for distribution before or during the business sessions publication in the Official Notice of the Convention.

"Section 4. The Council may propose amendments to amendments at the time of the Convention without meeting the procedural requirements described in Constitution 7-3, provided that in each instance the proposed amendment to an amendment has been approved by two-thirds of the Council and copies are distributed before or during the business sessions."

G. Bylaws: Amend Article 13, pages 185-186, as follows:

[Common bylaw, all divisions, divided vote]

"Section 1. (a) Pursuant to Constitution 5-7-(a)-(1) and (2), these bylaws may be amended at any annual or special Convention or at the annual Division I-A or I-AA legislative meeting by a majority vote of the delegates present and voting [except the establishment of a division championship, which requires a two-thirds majority vote per Constitution 5-8-(f)].

"(1) provided that the proposed amendments proposed by the membership shall have been submitted to the secretary of the Association by mail or wired transmission received at the NCAA national office not later than November 1 March 15 (any amendment received after that date shall be postmarked not later than October 25 March 8) preceding an annual Convention, or 60 90 days preceding a special Convention or 45 75 days preceding the annual Division I-A or I-AA legislative meeting. The Council, by a two-thirds majority of its members present and voting, may establish a later date for the submission of amendments for an annual a legislative Convention when a special Convention is held after November 1 March 15.

"(2) Amendments sponsored by the NCAA Council, a division steering committee or the Presidents Commission shall be submitted to the national office not later than August 15 preceding a legislative or nonlegislative Convention or 90 days preceding a special Convention. The Council, by a two-thirds majority of its members present and voting, may establish a later date for the submission of amendments for a legislative or nonlegislative Convention when a special Convention is held after August 15.

"(b) Except for those sponsored by the NCAA Council, a division steering committee or the Presidents Commission, each proposed amendment for a legislative Convention shall be sponsored by a total of six 10 active members (not more than five of which may belong to the same member conference), sub-

mitted in accordance with the deadlines for receipt of amendments. The amendment shall be submitted in the name of the institution by the chief executive officer or the chief executive officer's designated representative.

"(c) Amendments proposed by the NCAA Council, a division steering committee or the Presidents Commission for a nonlegislative Convention shall be sponsored by 75 percent of the members (present and voting) of the applicable sponsoring group.

[Paragraph (c), relettered as (d), unchanged.]

"(d) (e) Each division of the Association may at any legislative or special Convention, by a majority vote of the members of such division present and voting [except the establishment of a division championship, which requires a two-thirds majority vote of all divisions per Constitution 5-8-(f)], adopt or amend any bylaw not inconsistent with the provisions of the constitution or this section. Bylaws 9, 10, 12 and 13 apply to all divisions of the Association; thus, any amendment of them shall be adopted either by all divisions or, in the event that any division does not have a quorum as prescribed by the constitution, by a majority vote of the delegates present and voting at the Convention. The other bylaw articles and sections may be amended by one or more divisions acting separately, and such legislation shall apply only to the division that adopts it.

[Paragraphs (f) through (h), relettered as (g) through (i), unchanged.]

"Section 2. (a) Not later than April 15 preceding a legislative Convention, the secretary shall publish in The NCAA News all proposed amendments submitted by the membership pursuant to Section 1 and all other proposals approved by the NCAA Council, a division steering committee or the Presidents Commission as of that date.

"(b) Not later than September 15 preceding a legislative or nonlegislative Convention, the secretary shall publish in The NCAA News all previously unpublished amendments submitted by the NCAA Council, a division steering committee or the Presidents Commission pursuant to Section 1.

"(c) Not later than 75 days preceding a special Convention, the secretary shall publish in The NCAA News all proposed amendments submitted by the membership pursuant to Section 1.

"(d) The secretary shall mail a copy of the proposed amendments to all members of the Association not later than November 29 15 preceding an annual Convention, or 45 days preceding a special Convention. If the Council establishes a date later than November 1 March 15 or August 15 for the submission of amendments for an annual a legislative Convention in accordance with Constitution 7-1-(a)-(1) and (2), it, by a two-thirds majority of its members present and voting, may establish a

later date for mailing a copy of the proposed amendments to the members.

"Section 3. A proposed amendment to the constitution may be amended at a Convention by a majority of the members present and voting, provided that the amendment to the proposed amendment does not increase the modification of the bylaw provision to be amended, and provided further that the amendment to the proposed amendment shall *have been* be submitted in writing to the secretary prior to 1 p.m. on the day preceding the division business sessions **not later than the October 15 preceding an annual Convention (any amendment received after that date must be postmarked not later than October 8) or 60 days preceding a special Convention and shall be sponsored by a total of 10 active member institutions (not more than five of which may belong to the same member conference).** The secretary shall prepare copies of the amendments to the proposed amendments for distribution before or during the business sessions **publication in the Official Notice of the Convention.**

"Section 4. The Council may propose amendments to amendments at the time of the Convention without meeting the procedural requirements described in Constitution 7-3, provided that in each instance the proposed amendment to an amendment has been approved by two-thirds of the Council and copies are distributed before or during the business sessions."

Source: NCAA Council (Special Subcommittee on the Incorporation of Interpretations and Legislation in the NCAA Manual).

Intent: To establish a biennial legislative Convention and a revised legislative calendar that permits the submission of legislative proposals on a biennial basis; to permit the consideration of "housekeeping" proposals during nonlegislative Conventions; to permit the consideration of legislative proposals with delayed effective dates in division business sessions during nonlegislative Conventions; to increase the minimum sponsorship requirement for an amendment to the constitution and bylaws and for a resolution from six to 10 member institutions (not more than five of which may belong to the same member conference); to increase the minimum sponsorship requirement for an amendment to an amendment from one to 10 member institutions (not more than five of which may belong to the same member conference), and to confirm that resolutions may be sponsored by the Presidents Commission or a division steering committee. [Note: Case No. 176 will be revised upon adoption of this proposal.]

Effective Date: February 1, 1990.

Action: Withdrawn.

NO. 48 ANNUAL LEGISLATIVE CALENDAR

A. Constitution: Amend Article 6, Section 4, pages 51-52, as follows:

[All divisions, common vote]

A-40 _____ 1989 Convention Proceedings

"Section 4. Resolutions. Legislation may be enacted through resolutions not inconsistent with the constitution, bylaws, case-book interpretations, special rules of order, executive regulations, enforcement program and football television plan at any annual or special Convention by a majority of the delegates present and voting, provided the legislation is of a temporary character effective only for the time specified in the resolution itself, and provided further that the proposed resolution shall have been submitted in writing to the secretary **NCAA national office** prior to 1 p.m. on the day preceding the division business sessions, except for those resolutions sponsored by the Council, which shall observe the procedure set forth in Bylaw 13-4 **October 15.**

"(a) If the resolution is not sponsored by the Council, the **Presidents Commission or a division steering committee,** it shall be sponsored by at least *six* **10** active members (not more than five of which may belong to the same member conference) and it shall be submitted in the name of each institution by the chief executive officer or the chief executive officer's designated representative."

[Paragraphs (b) through (d) unchanged.]

B. Constitution: Amend Article 7, pages 53-54, as follows:

[All divisions, common vote]

"Section 1. (a) This constitution may be amended at any annual or special Convention by a two-thirds majority of the delegates present and voting.

"(1) provided that the proposed **a**Amendments proposed by the membership shall *have been* be submitted to the secretary of the Association by mail or wired transmission received at the NCAA national office not later than *November 1* **April 15** (any amendment received after that date must be postmarked not later than *October 25* **April 8**) preceding an annual Convention, or *60* **90** days preceding a special Convention. The Council, by a two-thirds majority of its members present and voting, may establish a later date for the submission of amendments for an annual Convention when a special Convention is held after *November 1* **April 15.**

"(2) **Amendments sponsored by the NCAA Council, a division steering committee or the Presidents Commission shall be submitted to the national office not later than August 15 preceding an annual Convention, or 90 days preceding a special Convention. The Council, by a two-thirds majority of its members present and voting, may establish a later date for the submission of amendments for an annual Convention when a special Convention is held after August 15.**

"(b) Except for those sponsored by the NCAA Council, a division steering committee or the Presidents Commission, each proposed amendment shall be sponsored by a total of *six* **10** active members (not more than five of which may belong to the

Legislative Proposals _____ A-41

same member conference), submitted in accordance with the deadlines for receipt of amendments. The amendment shall be submitted in the name of the institution by the chief executive officer or the chief executive officer's designated representative."

[Paragraph (c) unchanged.]

"Section 2. (a) Not later than May 15, the secretary shall publish in The NCAA News all proposed amendments submitted by the membership pursuant to Section 1.

"(b) Not later than September 15, the secretary shall publish in The NCAA News all proposed amendments submitted by the NCAA Council, a division steering committee or the Presidents Commission.

"(c) Not later than 75 days preceding a special Convention, the secretary shall publish in The NCAA News all proposed amendments submitted by the membership pursuant to Section 1.

"(d) The secretary shall mail a copy of the proposed amendments to all members of the Association not later than November 29 15 preceding an annual Convention, or 45 days preceding a special Convention. If the Council establishes a date later than November 1 April 15 or August 15 for the submission of amendments for an annual Convention in accordance with Constitution 7-1-(a)-(1) and (2), it, by a two-thirds majority of its members present and voting, may establish a later date for mailing a copy of the proposed amendments to the members.

"Section 3. A proposed amendment to the constitution may be amended at a Convention by a majority of the members present and voting, provided that the amendment to the proposed amendment does not increase the modification of the constitutional provision to be amended, and provided further that the amendment to the proposed amendment shall have been submitted in writing to the secretary NCAA national office prior to 1 p.m. on the day preceding the division business sessions not later than the October 15 preceding an annual Convention (any amendment received after that date must be postmarked not later than October 8) or 60 days preceding a special Convention and shall be sponsored by a total of 10 active member institutions (not more than five of which may belong to the same member conference). The secretary shall prepare copies of the amendments to the proposed amendments for distribution before or during the business sessions publication in the Official Notice of the Convention.

"Section 4. The Council may propose amendments to amendments at the time of the Convention without meeting the procedural requirements described in Constitution 7-3, provided that in each instance the proposed amendment to an amendment has been approved by two-thirds of the Council and copies are distributed before or during the business sessions."

C. Bylaws: Amend Article 13, pages 185-186, as follows:

A-42 _____ 1989 Convention Proceedings

[Common bylaw, all divisions, divided vote]

"Section 1. (a) These bylaws may be amended at any annual or special Convention or at the annual Division I-A or I-AA legislative meeting by a majority vote of the delegates present and voting [except the establishment of a division championship, which requires a two-thirds majority vote per Constitution 5-8-(f)].

"(1) provided that the proposed amendments proposed by the membership shall have been submitted to the secretary of the Association by mail or wired transmission received at the NCAA national office not later than November 1 April 15 (any amendment received after that date shall be postmarked not later than October 25 April 8) preceding an annual Convention, or 60 90 days preceding a special Convention or 45 75 days preceding the annual Division I-A or I-AA legislative meeting. The Council, by a two-thirds majority of its members present and voting, may establish a later date for the submission of amendments for an annual Convention when a special Convention is held after November 1 April 15.

"(2) Amendments sponsored by the NCAA Council, a division steering committee or the Presidents Commission shall be submitted to the national office not later than August 15 preceding an annual Convention, or 90 days preceding a special Convention. The Council, by a two-thirds majority of its members present and voting, may establish a later date for the submission of amendments for an annual Convention when a special Convention is held after August 15.

"(b) Except for those sponsored by the NCAA Council, a division steering committee or the Presidents Commission, each proposed amendment shall be sponsored by a total of six 10 active members (not more than five of which may be members of the same member conference), submitted in accordance with the deadlines for receipt of amendments. The amendment shall be submitted in the name of the institution by the chief executive officer or the chief executive officer's designated representative."

[Paragraphs (c) through (h) unchanged.]

"Section 2. (a) Not later than May 15, the secretary shall publish in The NCAA News all proposed amendments submitted by the membership pursuant to Section 1.

"(b) Not later than September 15, the secretary shall publish in The NCAA News all proposed amendments submitted by the Council, a division steering committee or the Presidents Commission.

"(c) Not later than 75 days preceding a special Convention, the secretary shall publish in The NCAA News all proposed amendments submitted by the mem-

Legislative Proposals _____ A-43

bership pursuant to Section 1.

"(d) The secretary shall mail a copy of the proposed amendments to all members of the Association not later than November 29 15 preceding an annual Convention, or 45 days preceding a special Convention or 30 days preceding the annual Division I-A or I-AA legislative meeting. If the Council establishes a date later than November 1 April 15 or August 15 for the submission of amendments for an annual Convention in accordance with Bylaw 13-1-(a)-(1) and (2), it, by a two-thirds majority of its members present and voting, may establish a later date for mailing a copy of the proposed amendments to the members.

"Section 3. A proposed amendment to the bylaws may be amended at a Convention by a majority vote of the members present and voting, provided that the amendment to the proposed amendment does not increase the modification of the bylaw provision to be amended, and provided further that the amendment to the proposed amendment shall have been submitted in writing to the secretary NCAA national office prior to 1 p.m. on the day preceding the division business sessions not later than the October 15 preceding an annual Convention (any amendment received after that date must be postmarked not later than October 8) or 60 days preceding a special Convention and shall be sponsored by a total of 10 active member institutions (not more than five of which may belong to the same member conference). The secretary shall prepare copies of the amendments to the proposed amendments for distribution before or during the business sessions publication in the Official Notice of the Convention.

"Section 4. The Council may propose amendments to amendments at the time of the Convention without meeting the procedural requirements described in Bylaw 13-3, provided that in each instance the proposed amendment to an amendment has been approved by two-thirds of the Council and copies are distributed before or during the business sessions."

Source: NCAA Council (Special Subcommittee on the Incorporation of Interpretations and Legislation in the NCAA Manual).

Intent: To revise the Association's annual legislative calendar by establishing earlier submission dates for resolutions, amendments and amendments to amendments, as well as specified, earlier dates for the publication of proposed legislation in The NCAA News and the Official Notice of each Convention; to increase the minimum sponsorship requirement for an amendment to the constitution and bylaws and for a resolution from six to 10 member institutions (not more than five of which may belong to the same member conference); to increase the minimum sponsorship requirement for an amendment to an amendment from one to 10 member institutions (not more than five of which may belong to the same member conference), and to confirm that resolutions may be sponsored by the Presidents Commission or a division steering committee. [Note: Case No. 176 will be revised upon adoption of this proposal.]

A-44 _____ 1989 Convention Proceedings

Effective Date: February 1, 1990.

Action: Approved by all divisions as amended by Nos. 48-1, 48-2, 48-4 and 48-5.

NO. 48-1 ANNUAL LEGISLATIVE CALENDAR

A. Amend Proposal No. 48-4, Constitution 6-4-(a), pages 37-38, as follows:

[All divisions, common vote]

"(a) If the resolution is not sponsored by the Council, the Presidents Commission or a division steering committee, it shall be sponsored by at least 10 **eight** active members (not more than five of which may belong to the same member conference) and it shall be submitted in the name of each institution by the chief executive officer or the chief executive officer's designated representative."

B. Amend Proposal No. 48-B, Constitution 7-1-(b), page 38, as follows:

[All divisions, common vote]

"(b) Except for those sponsored by the NCAA Council, a division steering committee or the Presidents Commission, each proposed amendment shall be sponsored by a total of 10 **eight** active members (not more than five of which may belong to the same member conference), and submitted in accordance with the deadlines for receipt of amendments. The amendment shall be submitted in the name of the institution by the chief executive officer or the chief executive officer's designated representative."

C. Amend Proposal No. 48-B, Constitution 7-3, page 39, as follows:

[All divisions, common vote]

"Section 3. A proposed amendment to the constitution may be amended at a Convention by a majority of the members present and voting, provided that the amendment to the proposed amendment does not increase the modification of the constitutional provision to be amended, and provided further that the amendment to the proposed amendment shall be submitted in writing to the NCAA national office not later than the October 15 preceding an annual Convention (any amendment received after that date must be postmarked not later than October 8) or 60 days preceding a special Convention and shall be sponsored by a total of 10 **eight** active member institutions (not more than five of which may belong to the same member conference). The secretary shall prepare copies of the amendments to the proposed amendments for publication in the Official Notice of the Convention."

D. Amend Proposal No. 48-C, Bylaw 13-1-(b), page 40, as follows:

[Common bylaw, all divisions, divided vote]

"(b) Except for those sponsored by the NCAA Council, a division steering committee or the Presidents Commission, each proposed amendment shall be sponsored by a total of 10 **eight** active members (not more than five of which may belong to the same member conference), and submitted in accordance with the deadlines for receipt of amendments. The amendment shall be submitted in

Legislative Proposals _____ A-45

the name of the institution by the chief executive officer or the chief executive officer's designated representative."

E. Amend Proposal No. 48-C, Bylaw 13-3, pages 40-41, as follows:

[Common bylaw, all divisions, divided vote]

"Section 3. A proposed amendment to the bylaws may be amended at a Convention by a majority vote of the members present and voting, provided that the amendment to the proposed amendment not increase the modification of the bylaw provision to be amended, and provided further that the amendment to the proposed amendment shall have been submitted in writing to the NCAA national office not later than the October 15 preceding an annual Convention (any amendment received after that date must be postmarked not later than October 8) or 60 days preceding a special Convention and shall be sponsored by a total of 10 **eight** active member institutions (*not more than five of which may belong to the same member conference*). The secretary shall prepare copies of the amendments to the proposed amendments for publication in the Official Notice of the Convention."

Source: All 10 members of the Pacific-10 Conference.

Action: Approved by all divisions.

NO. 48-2 ANNUAL LEGISLATIVE CALENDAR

A. Amend Proposal No. 48-B, Constitution 7-1-(a)-(1), page 38, as follows:

[All divisions, common vote]

"(1) Amendments proposed by the membership shall be submitted by mail or wired transmission received at the NCAA national office not later than **April 15 July 1** (any amendment received after that date must be postmarked not later than **April 8 June 24**) preceding an annual Convention, or 90 days preceding a special Convention. The Council, by a two-thirds majority of its members present and voting, may establish a later date for the submission of amendments for an annual Convention when a special Convention is held after **April 15 July 1**."

B. Amend Proposal No. 48-B, Bylaw 7-2, pages 38-39, as follows:

[All divisions, common vote]

"(a) Not later than **May 15 August 1**, the secretary shall publish in The NCAA News all proposed amendments submitted by the membership pursuant to Section 1."

[Paragraphs (b) and (c) unchanged.]

"(d) The secretary shall mail a copy of the proposed amendments to all members of the Association not later than November 15 preceding an annual Convention, or 45 days preceding a special Convention. If the Council establishes a date later than **April 15 July 1** or August 15 for the submission of amendments for an annual Convention in accordance with Constitution 7-1-(a)-(1) and (2), it, by a two-thirds majority of its members present and voting, may establish a later date for

mailing a copy of the proposed amendments to the members."

C. Amend Proposal No. 48-C, Bylaw 13-1-(a)-(1), pages 39-40, as follows:

[Common bylaw, all divisions, divided vote]

"(1) Amendments proposed by the membership shall be submitted by mail or wired transmission received at the NCAA national office not later than **April 15 July 1** (any amendment received after that date shall be postmarked not later than **April 8 June 24**) preceding an annual Convention, or 90 days preceding a special Convention or 75 days preceding the annual Division I-A or I-AA legislative meetings. The Council, by a two-thirds majority of its members present and voting, may establish a later date for the submission of amendments for an annual Convention when a special Convention is held after **April 15 July 1**."

D. Amend Proposal No. 48-C, Bylaw 13-2, page 40, as follows:

[Common bylaw, all divisions, divided vote]

"(a) Not later than **May 15 August 1**, the secretary shall publish in The NCAA News all proposed amendments submitted by the membership pursuant to Section 1."

[Paragraphs (b) and (c) unchanged.]

"(d) The secretary shall mail a copy of the proposed amendments to all members of the Association not later than November 15 preceding an annual Convention, or 45 days preceding a special Convention or 30 days preceding the annual Division I-A or I-AA legislative meeting. If the Council establishes a date later than **April 15 July 1** or August 15 for the submission of amendments for an annual Convention in accordance with Bylaw 13-1-(a)-(1) and (2), it, by a two-thirds majority of its members present and voting, may establish a later date for mailing a copy of the proposed amendments to the members."

Source: U.S. Air Force Academy.

Action: Approved by all divisions.

NO. 48-3 ANNUAL LEGISLATIVE CALENDAR

A. Amend Proposal No. 48-B, Constitution 7-1-(a)-(1), page 38, as follows:

[All divisions, common vote]

"(1) Amendments proposed by the membership shall be submitted by mail or wired transmission received at the NCAA national office not later than **April 15 June 1** (any amendment received after that date must be postmarked no later than **April 8 May 25**) preceding an annual Convention, or 90 days preceding a special Convention. The Council, by a two-thirds majority of its members present and voting, may establish a later date for the submission of amendments for an annual Convention when a special Convention is held after **April 15 June 1**."

- B. Amend Proposal No. 48-B, Constitution 7-2, pages 38-39, as follows:

[All divisions, common vote]

"(a) Not later than *May 15 July 1*, the secretary shall publish in The NCAA News all proposed amendments submitted by the membership pursuant to Section 1."

[Paragraphs (b) and (c) unchanged.]

"(d) The secretary shall mail a copy of the proposed amendments to all members of the Association not later than November 15 preceding an annual Convention, or 45 days preceding a special Convention. If the Council establishes a date later than *April 15 June 1* or August 15 for the submission of amendments for an annual Convention in accordance with Constitution 7-1-(a)-(1) and (2), it, by a two-thirds majority of its members present and voting, may establish a later date for mailing a copy of the proposed amendments to the members."

- C. Amend Proposal No. 48-C, Bylaw 13-1-(a)-(1), pages 39-40, as follows:

[Common bylaw, all divisions, divided vote]

"(1) Amendments proposed by the membership shall be submitted by mail or wired transmission received at the NCAA national office not later than *April 15 June 1* (any amendment received after that date shall be postmarked not later than *April 8 May 25*) preceding an annual Convention, or 90 days preceding a special Convention or 75 days preceding the annual Division I-A or I-AA legislative meeting. The Council, by a two-thirds majority of its members present and voting, may establish a later date for the submission of amendments for an annual Convention when a special Convention is held after *April 15 June 1*."

- D. Amend Proposal No. 48-C, Bylaw 13-2, page 40, as follows:

[Common bylaw, all divisions, divided vote]

"(a) Not later than *May 15 July 1*, the secretary shall publish in The NCAA News all proposed amendments submitted by the membership pursuant to Section 1."

[Paragraphs (b) and (c) unchanged.]

"(d) The secretary shall mail a copy of the proposed amendments to all members of the Association not later than November 15 preceding an annual Convention, or 45 days preceding a special Convention or 30 days preceding the annual Division I-A or I-AA legislative meeting. If the Council establishes a date later than *April 15 June 1* or August 15 for the submission of amendments for an annual Convention in accordance with Bylaw 13-1-(a)-(1) and (2), it, by a two-thirds majority of its members present and voting, may establish a later date for mailing a copy of the proposed amendments to the members."

Source: All 10 members of the Pacific-10 Conference.

Action: Moot due to approval of No. 48-2.

NO. 48-4 ANNUAL LEGISLATIVE CALENDAR

- A. Amend Proposal No. 48-B, Constitution 7, page 39, by adding Section 4, as follows:

[All divisions, common vote]

"Section 4. The Council may propose amendments to amendments at the time of the Convention without meeting the procedural requirements described in Constitution 7-3, provided that in each instance the proposed amendment to an amendment has been approved by two-thirds of the Council and copies are distributed before or during the business sessions."

- B. Amend Proposal No. 48-C, Bylaw 13, page 41, by adding Section 4, as follows:

"Section 4. The Council may propose amendments to amendments at the time of the Convention without meeting the procedural requirements described in Constitution 7-3, provided that in each instance the proposed amendment to an amendment has been approved by two-thirds of the Council and copies are distributed before or during the business sessions."

Source: NCAA Council and Pacific-10 Conference.

Action: Approved by all divisions.

NO. 48-5 ANNUAL LEGISLATIVE CALENDAR

Amend Proposal No. 48, Constitution 6-4, page 37, as follows:

[All divisions, common vote]

"Section 4. Resolutions. Legislation may be enacted through resolutions not inconsistent with the constitution, bylaws, case-book interpretations, special rules of order, executive regulations, enforcement program and football television plan at any annual or special Convention by a majority of the delegates present and voting, provided the legislation is of a temporary character effective only for the time specified in the resolution itself, and provided further that the proposed resolution shall have been submitted in writing to the NCAA national office prior to October 15, except for those resolutions sponsored by the Council, which may be proposed at the time of the Convention, provided that the proposed resolution has been approved by two-thirds of the Council and copies are distributed before or during the business sessions."

Source: NCAA Council.

Action: Approved.

Academics

NO. 49 INITIAL ELIGIBILITY-STANDARDIZED TESTING DEADLINE

A. Bylaws: Amend note following Article 5, Section 1-(j), pages 104-105, as follows:

[Division I only]

"[Note: Division I-A qualifier as used herein is defined as one who is a high school graduate and who:

"(i) Presented an accumulative minimum grade-point average of 2.000 (based on a maximum of 4.000) in a successfully completed core curriculum of at least 11 academic courses including at least three years in English, two years in mathematics, two years in social science and two years in natural or physical science (including at least one laboratory course, if offered by the high school) at the time of graduation from high school as certified on the high school transcript or by official correspondence, as well as a 700 combined score on the SAT verbal and math sections or a 15 composite score on the ACT. The minimum required SAT or ACT score must be achieved no later than: (1) the July 1 immediately preceding the individual's first enrollment in a collegiate institution, or (2) the end of the individual's final term of secondary education."

[Remainder of note unchanged.]

B. Bylaws: Amend note following Article 5, Section 1-(j), pages 106-107, as follows:

[Division II only]

"[Note: Division II-A qualifier as used herein is defined as one who is a high school graduate and who:

"(i) Presented an accumulative minimum grade-point average of 2.000 (based on a maximum of 4.000) in a successfully completed core curriculum of at least 11 academic courses including at least three years in English, two years in mathematics, two years in social science and two years in natural or physical science (including at least one laboratory course, if offered by the high school) prior to initial enrollment at a collegiate institution as certified on the official transcript or by official correspondence, as well as a 700 combined score on the SAT verbal and math sections or a 15 composite score on the ACT. The minimum required SAT or ACT score must be achieved *no later than the July 1 immediately preceding* prior to the individual's first enrollment in a collegiate institution."

[Remainder of note unchanged.]

Source: NCAA Council (Divisions I and II Steering Committees).

Intent: To permit a Division I prospective student-athlete to achieve A-50 _____ 1989 Convention Proceedings

the minimum required SAT or ACT score not later than the end of the student's final term of secondary education or the July 1 immediately preceding the individual's first enrollment in a collegiate institution, and to allow a Division II prospective student-athlete to fulfill the standardized test requirement at any time prior to initial collegiate enrollment.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: Part A approved by Division I, part B approved by Division II.

NO. 50 OBVIOUS QUALIFIER

Bylaws: Amend note following Article 5, Section 1-(j), by adding new subsection (iii), pages 105 and 107, as follows:

[Divided bylaw, Divisions I and II, divided vote]

"[Note: A qualifier as used herein is defined as one who is a high school graduate and who:

[Subparagraphs (i) and (ii) unchanged.]

"(iii) Presented more than the minimum standard set forth in the preceding subparagraphs, including an accumulative grade-point average of at least 3.000 (based on a maximum of 4.000) and a combined score of at least 1,000 on the SAT or a composite score of at least 23 on the ACT. Such an obvious qualifier shall not be subject to certification pursuant to NCAA Form 48-C or 48-H, provided the minimum required SAT or ACT score was achieved not later than July 1 immediately preceding the individual's first enrollment in a collegiate institution."

[Remainder of note unchanged.]

Source: Boston College, Brigham Young University, Georgia Institute of Technology, Pennsylvania State University, U.S. Air Force Academy, U.S. Military Academy and one other member institution.

Intent: To eliminate the requirement to certify the eligibility of student-athletes, through use of NCAA Forms 48-C and 48-H, for those student-athletes who clearly exceed the minimum requirements for initial eligibility.

Effective Date: August 1, 1989.

Action: Defeated by Divisions I and II (Division II vote 62-93).

NO. 51 RESOLUTION: INITIAL-ELIGIBILITY CLEARINGHOUSE

[All divisions, common vote]

"Whereas, revised Bylaw 5-1-(j), popularly known as 'Proposition 48,' is regarded widely as useful and appropriate NCAA legislation and generally has met the expectations of its supporters; and

"Whereas, it is apparent that young athletes now are taking

Legislative Proposals _____ A-51

their high school course work more seriously to prepare themselves for the college academic experience; and

"Whereas, the current procedures used to apply this useful and effective bylaw have resulted in serious inconsistencies of interpretation of high school records by college personnel at different member institutions; and

"Whereas, such inconsistencies are usually the result of honest mistakes due to the many ambiguities inherent in a process that attempts to standardize the interpretation of high school transcripts; and

"Whereas, the implementation of the rule has resulted in excessive costs to secondary and postsecondary institutions; and

"Whereas, costs to colleges are replicated by each of the several institutions that recruit an individual prospective student-athlete; and

"Whereas, serious adversarial relationships between college and high school personnel often result when conscientious admissions officers/registrars return incorrect forms to high schools (often for minor, technical reasons) to meet compliance standards; and

"Whereas, there is no provision to penalize a high school that fails to notify all involved colleges when its Form 48-H is adjusted during the recruiting year, possibly creating unfair recruiting advantages; and

"Whereas, numerous college admissions officers/registrars throughout the country have discussed the merits of a centralized freshman student-athlete certification office and generally support the establishment of such an office; and

"Whereas, good management principles provide for the continued evaluation of practices and procedures; thus, when it can be demonstrated that consistency of rules interpretation and cost effectiveness of freshman certification of eligibility can be improved by different approaches, existing practices and procedures should be appropriately adjusted;

"Now, Therefore, Be It Resolved, that within 12 months, the National Collegiate Athletic Association submit to the Divisions I and II membership a plan providing for the centralization of the certification of entering college freshman athletes, said plan to establish an office that will determine whether minimum standards have been met regarding: (1) core-course requirements, (2) high school and core-course grade-point averages, (3) standardized test scores, and (4) certification of high school graduation; and

"Be It Further Resolved, that individuals designated to develop this centralization plan should include not fewer than three college admissions officers/registrars (selected in consultation with the American Association of Collegiate Registrars and Admissions Officers) and two secondary school principals/counselors (selected in consultation with the National Association of Secondary School Principals); and

"Be It Finally Resolved, that funding for the certification office be

provided by the Association at an estimated annual cost of \$550,000, with a more definitive cost figure to be determined by this study."

Source: University of Illinois, Champaign; Indiana University, Bloomington; University of Iowa; Michigan State University; University of Minnesota, Twin Cities; Northwestern University, and three other members of the Big Ten Conference.

Action: Defeated.

NO. 51-1 RESOLUTION: INITIAL-ELIGIBILITY CLEARINGHOUSE

[All divisions, common vote]

"Whereas, revised Bylaw 5-1-(j), popularly known as 'Proposition 48,' is regarded widely as useful and appropriate NCAA legislation and generally has met the expectations of its supporters; and

"Whereas, it is apparent that young athletes now are taking their high school course work more seriously to prepare themselves for the college academic experience; and

"Whereas, the current procedures used to apply this useful and effective bylaw have resulted in serious inconsistencies of interpretation of high school records by college personnel at different member institutions; and

"Whereas, such inconsistencies are usually the result of honest mistakes due to the many ambiguities inherent in a process that attempts to standardize the interpretation of high school transcripts; and

"Whereas, the implementation of the rule has resulted in excessive costs to secondary and postsecondary institutions; and

"Whereas, costs to colleges are replicated by each of the several institutions that recruit an individual prospective student-athlete; and

"Whereas, serious adversarial relationships between college and high school personnel often result when conscientious admissions officers/registrars return incorrect forms to high schools (often for minor, technical reasons) to meet compliance standards; and

"Whereas, there is no provision to penalize a high school that fails to notify all involved colleges when its Form 48-H is adjusted during the recruiting year, possibly creating unfair recruiting advantages; and

"Whereas, numerous college admissions officers/registrars throughout the country have discussed the merits of a centralized freshman student-athlete certification office and generally support the establishment of such an office; and

"Whereas, good management principles provide for the continued evaluation of practice and procedures; thus, when it can be demonstrated that consistency of rules interpretations and cost effectiveness of freshman certification of eligibility can be improved by different approaches, existing practice and procedures should be appropriately adjusted;

"Now, Therefore, Be It Resolved, that within 12 months, the National Collegiate Athletic Association submit to the Divisions I and II membership a plan providing for the centralization of the certification of entering college freshman athletes, said plan to establish an office that will determine whether minimum standards have been met regarding: (1) core-course requirements, (2) high school and core-course grade-point averages, (3) standardized test scores, and (4) certification of high school graduation, and

"Now, Therefore, Be It Resolved, that a study be conducted by the National Collegiate Athletic Association, at an estimated cost of \$15,000, to determine the feasibility of creating a clearinghouse to centralize the certification of the minimum academic eligibility standards for entering college freshman athletes (i.e., core-course requirements, high school and core-course grade-point averages, standardized test scores, and certification of high school graduation); and

"Be It Further Resolved, that individuals designated to develop this centralization plan conduct the study should include not fewer than three college admissions officers/registrars (selected in consultation with the American Association of Collegiate Registrars and Admissions Officers) and two secondary school principals/counselors (selected in consultation with the National Association of Secondary School Principals); and

"Be It Finally Resolved, that funding for the certification office be provided by the Association at an estimated annual cost of \$550,000, with a more definitive cost figure to be determined by this study that findings of the study be reported to the Division I and Division II membership at the 1990 NCAA Convention."

Source: Michigan State University.

Action: Defeated.

NO. 52 SATISFACTORY PROGRESS

Bylaws: Amend Article 5, Section 1-(j)-(6), by adding new subparagraph (v), page 110, renumbering subsequent subparagraphs, as follows:

[Division I only]

"(v) To fulfill the 'satisfactory-completion' requirement of this provision, the student-athlete must achieve an accumulative minimum grade-point average of 2.000 (based on a maximum of 4.000) at the certifying institution by the beginning of the third year of collegiate enrollment (fifth semester or seventh quarter) and must achieve an accumulative minimum grade-point average of 2.000 at the beginning of each subsequent fall term. If the student-athlete is ineligible under this provision at the beginning of the fall term, eligibility may be reinstated at the beginning of any other regular term of that academic year based upon an accumulative minimum grade-point average of 2.000."

Source: All nine members of the Mid-American Athletic Conference.

Intent: To further define satisfactory progress in Division I as the achievement of an accumulative average of 2.000 by the beginning of the third year of collegiate enrollment and each subsequent year of collegiate enrollment.

Effective Date: August 1, 1992, for those student-athletes first entering Division I member institutions subsequent to the 1989-90 academic year.

Action: Defeated by Division I.

NO. 53 SATISFACTORY PROGRESS

Bylaws: Amend Article 5, Section 1-(j)-(6), by adding new subparagraph (v), page 110, renumbering subsequent subparagraphs, as follows:

[Division I only]

"(v) The student-athlete must achieve the following accumulative minimum grade-point average (based on a maximum of 4.000) at the certifying institution to fulfill the 'satisfactory-completion' requirement of this provision: (1) 1.600 after the completion of the first season of competition; (2) 1.800 after the completion of the second season of competition, and (3) 2.000 after the completion of the third season of competition and subsequent seasons of competition."

Source: All 10 members of the Big Ten Conference.

Intent: To further define satisfactory progress in Division I as the achievement of a 1.600 grade-point average after completion of the first season of competition, a 1.800 grade-point average after completion of the second season of competition, and a 2.000 grade-point average after completion of the third and subsequent seasons of competition.

Effective Date: August 1, 1990, for those student-athletes first entering Division I member institutions subsequent to the 1989-90 academic year.

Action: Defeated by Division I, 113-194; considered prior to No. 52 after Convention approved change in order.

NO. 54 SATISFACTORY PROGRESS

Bylaws: Amend Article 5, Section 1-(j)-(6)-(ii) and (iii), and add new subparagraph (iv), page 109, renumbering subsequent subparagraphs, as follows:

[Divided bylaw, Divisions I and II, divided vote]

"(ii) Eligibility for regular-season competition subsequent to the student-athlete's first academic year in residence or after the student-athlete has utilized one season of eligibility in any sport at the certifying institution shall be determined by the student-athlete's academic record in existence at the beginning of the fall

term of the regular academic year based upon: (1) satisfactory completion prior to each fall term of **an the following** accumulative total of semester or quarter hours of academic credit that is equivalent to the completion of an average of at least 12: (a) 24 semester or 36 quarter hours during each of the previous academic terms in academic years in which the student-athlete has been enrolled in a term or terms by the beginning of the second academic year, or (b) 51 semester or 76 quarter hours by the beginning of the third academic year, or (c) 78 semester or 116 quarter hours by the beginning of the fourth academic year, or (d) 105 semester or 156 quarter hours by the beginning of the fifth academic year; or (2) for student-athletes who have spent two or more academic years in residence, satisfactory completion of 24 27 semester or 36 40 quarter hours of academic credit since the beginning of the previous fall term. A student-athlete shall meet the 'satisfactory-completion' requirement by maintaining a grade-point average that places the student-athlete in good academic standing as established by the institution for all students who are at an equivalent stage of progress toward a degree.

"(iii) If the student-athlete is ineligible under (ii) at the beginning of the fall term, eligibility may be reinstated at the beginning of any other regular term of that academic year, based upon: (1) an accumulative total of semester or quarter hours of academic credit that is equivalent to the completion of an average of at least 12 semester or quarter hours during each of the previous academic terms during the first academic year and 14 semester or quarter hours during each previous academic year in which the student-athlete has been enrolled in a term or terms; or (2) for student-athletes who have spent one academic year in residence, satisfactory completion of 24 semester or 36 quarter hours of academic credit during the certifying institution's preceding two semesters or three quarters, or (3) for student-athletes who have spent two or more academic years in residence, satisfactory completion of 27 semester or 40 quarter hours of academic credit during the certifying institution's preceding two semesters or three quarters.

"(iv) The NCAA Academic Requirements Committee shall be authorized to waive these provisions for an institution that requires fewer than 120 semester units for a baccalaureate degree. The waiver shall replace the requirements specified in this section with a prorated requirement that shall be not less than 12 semester or quarter hours of academic credit per semester or quarter."

Source: Arizona State University; University of Illinois, Champaign; University of Indiana, Bloomington; University of Iowa; University of Notre Dame; Pennsylvania State University, and two other member institutions.

Intent: To increase the satisfactory-progress requirement for the minimum number of academic credits a student-athlete must earn after the first and subsequent years in residence and to eliminate the "averaging method" as an alternative in the initial annual determination of satisfactory progress.

Effective Date: August 1, 1990, for those student-athletes first entering Divisions I and II member institutions subsequent to the 1989-90 academic year.

Action: Defeated by Divisions I and II.

NO. 55 RESOLUTION: RECOGNITION OF THE NAAAA

[All divisions, common vote]

"Whereas, academic advisors for athletics constitute an integral part of the NCAA's intercollegiate athletics programs and enhance and support the student-athlete's entire collegiate experience by emphasizing both athletics determination and academic excellence; and

"Whereas, the National Association of Academic Advisors for Athletics (NAAAA) is a professional organization, founded in 1976, the primary purpose of which is to enhance and support the overall balance of academics and athletics during a student-athlete's collegiate experience;

"Now, Therefore, Be it Resolved, that the NCAA recognize the NAAAA as an organization whose goals are worthy of support; and

"Be It Further Resolved, that the NCAA express its willingness to seek input from the NAAAA membership regarding academically oriented legislative matters; and

"Be It Finally Resolved, that the NCAA express its willingness to consider immediately the membership of the NAAAA as a resource to fill regular and ex officio openings on committees that deal with academic issues."

Source: University of Alabama, Tuscaloosa; University of Florida; University of Georgia; University of Kentucky; Louisiana State University; University of Mississippi, and one other member of the Southeastern Conference.

Action: Withdrawn.

Financial Aid

NO. 56 FINANCIAL AID LIMITATION

A. Constitution: Amend Article 3, Section 1-(g)-(1), page 13, as follows:

[All divisions, common vote]

"(g) The following practices shall constitute 'pay' for participation in intercollegiate athletics and are expressly prohibited:

"(1) The award to a student-athlete of financial aid that exceeds the cost of attendance that normally is incurred by students enrolled in a comparable program at that institution."

tion or that exceeds the limitations set forth in Bylaw 6-1 for the membership division of the institution the student-athlete attends, whichever is less. **Neither limitation shall include the following governmental grants for educational purposes:**

"(i) Benefits received by student-athletes under the G.I. Bill of Rights;

"(ii) Payments to student-athletes for participation in military reserve training programs (for example, payments by the U.S. government for a student's participation in advanced ROTC or National Guard training shall not be construed under this principle to be 'employment' during semester or term time);

"(iii) Payments by the U.S. government under the terms of the War Orphans Educational Program, Social Security Insurance Program or Non-Service-Connected Veteran's Death Pension Program, or

"(iv) State government awards to disabled veterans, provided such awards are approved by the Council by a two-thirds majority of its members present and voting."

B. Bylaws: Amend Article 6, Section 1-(b)-(2), page 129, as follows:

[Divided bylaw, all divisions, divided vote]

"(2) Government grants for educational purposes, except:

"(i) Those grants listed in Constitution 3-1-(g)-(1), Benefits received by student-athletes under the G.I. Bill of Rights, or

"(ii) Payments to student-athletes for participation in military reserve training programs (for example, payments by the U.S. government for a student's participation in advanced ROTC or National Guard training shall not be construed under this principle to be 'employment' during semester or term time),

"(iii) Payments by the U.S. government under the terms of the War Orphans Educational Program, Social Security Insurance Program or Non-Service-Connected Veteran's Death Pension Program, or

"(iv) (ii) Pell Grants, provided the overall grant total, combining financial aid based on athletic ability and other institutionally administered financial aid and the Pell Grant, does not exceed the value of tuition, fees, room and board, and required course-related books, plus \$1,400 in Division I institutions or \$900 in Division II and Division III institutions.

"(v) State government awards to disabled veterans, provided such awards are approved by the Council by a two-thirds majority of its members present and voting."

Source: NCAA Council (Committee on Financial Aid and Amateurism).

Intent: To exempt the benefits received by student-athletes under A-58 _____ 1989 Convention Proceedings

the G.I. Bill of Rights; payments to student-athletes for participation in military reserve training programs; payments by the U.S. government under the terms of the War Orphans Educational Program, Social Security Insurance Program or Non-Service-Connected Veteran's Death Pension Program, and state government awards to disabled veterans programs approved by the Council from the computation used to determine whether a student-athlete's financial aid exceeds the cost of attendance that normally is incurred by students enrolled in a comparable program at that institution.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: Approved by all divisions.

NO. 57 SUMMER SCHOOL

A. Constitution: Amend Article 3, Section 4-(b)-(1), pages 21-22, as follows:

[All divisions, common vote]

"(1) Financial aid may not be provided a student while attending a summer school, or a summer term or a summer orientation program unless the student has been in residence a minimum of one term during the regular academic year or the student is attending a summer orientation program for which participation (by both athletes and nonathletes) is required and financial aid is administered on the same basis for all participants in the program. Such financial aid may be utilized only to attend the awarding institution's summer term or summer school, except that the NCAA Council, by a two-thirds majority of its members present and voting, may approve exceptions to this restriction for member institutions that have summer terms or summer schools curtailed because of the use of their facilities for the Olympic Games. In addition, any recipient of such aid who has not yet been in residence a minimum of one term during the regular academic year is subject to the following conditions:

"(i) The recipient must be admitted to the awarding member institution in accordance with regular, published entrance requirements;

"(ii) The recipient is subject to NCAA transfer provisions pursuant to Bylaw 5-1-(1)-(1);

"(iii) The recipient shall not engage in out-of-season practice activities pursuant to NCAA O.I.s 300 through 303, and

"(iv) The recipient shall become a countable student-athlete during the succeeding academic year pursuant to Bylaw 6-3."

B. Bylaws: Amend Article 5, Section 1-(1)-(1), page 114, as follows:

[Divided bylaw, all divisions, divided vote]

"(1) A student shall be considered a transfer from a collegiate institution when its registrar or admissions officer certifies

Legislative Proposals _____ A-59

that the student was officially registered and enrolled at said institution on the opening day of classes in any quarter or semester in a minimum full-time academic load, or that the student attended a class or classes in any quarter or semester in which the student was enrolled in a minimum full-time academic load; or the athletics director certifies that the student reported for regular squad practice announced by the institution through any member of its athletics department staff prior to the beginning of any quarter or semester, **or the student received institutional financial aid while attending summer school, a summer term or a summer orientation program.**"

Source: NCAA Council (Academic Requirements Committee, Recruiting Committee).

Intent: To permit member institutions to provide financial aid to first-year student-athletes to attend summer school, a summer term or a summer orientation program, provided aid recipients are admitted to the awarding member institution in accordance with regular, published entrance requirements; are subject to NCAA transfer provisions; do not engage in out-of-season practice activities, and become countable players.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: Defeated. Part B moot due to defeat of part A.

NO. 58 FINANCIAL AID—NONGRADUATES

A. Constitution: Amend Article 3, Section 4-(b), page 21, as follows:

[All divisions, common vote]

"(b) Except as specified in Constitution 3-4-(c), financial aid, including a grant-in-aid that carries with it a partial work requirement, may be awarded for any term (semester or quarter) during which a student-athlete is in regular attendance as an undergraduate with eligibility remaining under Bylaw 4-1, or within six years after initial enrollment in a collegiate institution (provided the student does not receive such aid for more than five years during that period), or as a graduate eligible under Constitution 3-3-(a)-(3), provided the student-athlete is not under contract to or currently receiving compensation from a professional sports organization. Financial aid awarded by an institution to a student-athlete shall conform to the rules and regulations of the awarding institution and of that institution's conference, if any."

[Subparagraphs (1) and (2) unchanged.]

B. Constitution: Amend Article 3, Section 4, by adding new paragraph (c), page 22, relettering subsequent paragraphs, as follows:

[All divisions, common vote]

"(c) A student-athlete who otherwise no longer would be eligible to receive financial aid per Constitution 3-4-

(b), but who has not completed undergraduate degree requirements at the institution for which he or she last competed, may be awarded financial aid by that institution, including a grant-in-aid that carries with it a partial work requirement, provided such financial aid does not exceed the limitation set forth in Bylaw 6-1.

"(1) To be eligible for such financial aid, the recipient must:

"(i) Meet the institution's admission or readmission requirements applicable to all students;

"(ii) Meet the institution's degree program requirements applicable to all students;

"(iii) Pursue a course of study that will meet the institution's undergraduate degree requirements in a specified area of study;

"(iv) Meet all other institutional requirements, including, but not limited to, standards of conduct both on and off campus, class attendance, and attendance at tutorial and counseling sessions, and

"(v) Have enrolled initially at the awarding institution on a full-time basis prior to the start of the fall semester or quarter of 1986.

"(2) The recipient may attend the awarding institution on a full- or part-time basis, provided any financial assistance received while attending on a part-time basis shall be reduced proportionately.

"(3) The recipient shall be eligible for such financial aid on a continuing basis not to exceed five academic years from the start of his or her admission or readmission pursuant to this program."

Source: All seven members of the Metropolitan Collegiate Athletic Conference.

Intent: To permit the provision of financial aid to former student-athletes who entered college prior to the effective date of "Proposition 48" [Bylaw 5-1-(j)] and who have not yet completed their undergraduate degree requirements.

Effective Date: August 1, 1989.

Action: Defeated.

NO. 59 EMPLOYMENT—EXHAUSTED ELIGIBILITY

Bylaws: Amend Article 6, Section 1-(b)-(1)-(i), page 129, as follows:

[Divided bylaw, all divisions, divided vote]

"(i) An institution shall count income from any employment during semester or term time, regardless of whether the student-athlete's job is one obtained following completion of eligibility in the student-athlete's senior year except that the term-time earnings of a student-ath-

lete who has exhausted eligibility in a particular sport during the prior academic year shall be exempt from the limitation, provided the student-athlete does not subsequently practice or compete in intercollegiate athletics; gifts given to a student-athlete following completion of eligibility in appreciation or recognition of the student-athlete's athletics accomplishments, and any bonus or salary from a professional sports organization, or any other income from participation in an athletics event, no matter when received or contracted for."

Source: All seven members of the Metropolitan Collegiate Athletic Conference.

Intent: To exempt the term-time earnings of an undergraduate student-athlete who has exhausted eligibility in a particular sport during the preceding academic year, provided the student-athlete does not subsequently practice or compete in intercollegiate athletics.

Effective Date: August 1, 1989.

Action: Approved by all divisions.

NO. 60 FINANCIAL AID LIMITATIONS—TUITION WAIVERS

Bylaws: Amend O.I. 600, following Bylaw 6-3-(c), page 131, as follows:

[Divisions I and II, common vote]

"O.I. 600. The term 'financial aid' as used in Bylaw 6 includes all institutional funds such as scholarships; grants; loans; work-study program assistance; on-campus employment, and aid from government or private sources for which the institution is responsible for selecting the recipient or determining the amount of aid, or providing matching or supplementary funds for a previously determined recipient, and assistance awarded in accordance with Constitution 3-4-(a)-(4), as well as off-campus employment earnings and other sources of aid during the academic year for which the athletics interests of the institution intercede in behalf of the recipient, except that honorary awards for outstanding academic achievement that are standing scholarship awards published in the institution's catalog, or established institutional research grant awards, the basis of the awards or grants being the candidates' academic records at the awarding institution and the awards or grants being determined by competition among the students of a particular class or college of the institution, and legitimate loans, based upon a regular repayment schedule, available to all students and administered on the same basis for all students, shall not be considered accountable financial aid. In addition, tuition remission, assistance or similar remuneration granted as a benefit of employment to a faculty or staff member shall not be considered accountable financial aid when awarded to that faculty or staff member's children."

A-62 _____ 1989 Convention Proceedings

Source: University of Illinois, Champaign; Indiana University, Bloomington; University of Iowa; Northwestern University; Ohio State University; Purdue University, and one other member of the Big Ten Conference.

Intent: To permit student-athletes who are children of faculty and staff at a member institution to receive tuition and fees waivers through the institution's employee benefits program, without such waivers counting against the maximum awards limitations.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: Withdrawn.

NO. 61 MAXIMUM AWARDS—DIVISION I-A FOOTBALL

Bylaws: Amend Article 6, Section 5-(c), page 133, as follows:

[Division I-A football only]

"(c) Division I-A Football—There shall be an annual limit of 30 for the 1988-89 academic year and 25 thereafter on the number of initial financial aid awards that may be made to student-athletes, and there shall be an annual limit of 95 on the total number of financial aid awards that may be in effect the same year, including initial awards, except that a financial aid award for a student-athlete who graduates at midyear may be replaced by an initial financial aid award. Such an initial award shall count toward the appropriate initial-awards limitation for the following academic year."

Source: University of Arkansas, Fayetteville; University of Florida; University of Georgia; University of Kentucky; University of Michigan; University of Mississippi, and three other member institutions.

Intent: To establish an annual limit of 24 initial financial aid awards in Division I-A football and to eliminate the annual limit of 95 on the total number of financial aid awards that may be in effect in the same year.

Effective Date: August 1, 1991.

Action: Defeated by Division I-A.

NO. 62 MAXIMUM AWARDS—DIVISION I-A FOOTBALL

Bylaws: Amend Article 6, Section 5-(c), page 133, as follows:

[Division I-A football only]

"(c) Division I-A Football—There shall be an annual limit of 30 for the 1988-89 academic year and 25 thereafter on the number of initial financial aid awards that may be made to student-athletes, and there shall be an annual limit of 95 on the total number of financial aid awards that may be in effect the same year, including initial awards, except that a financial aid award for a student-athlete who graduates at midyear may be replaced by an initial financial aid award. Such an initial award shall count toward the appropriate initial-awards limitation for the following academic year."

Legislative Proposals _____ A-63

Source: Iowa State University; University of Kansas; Rutgers University, New Brunswick; Syracuse University; University of Southern Mississippi, and Texas Tech University.

Intent: To increase from 25 to 30 the number of initial financial aid awards that may be made to student-athletes in Division I-A football.

Effective Date: August 1, 1989.

Action: Defeated by Division I-A, 45-63.

NO. 63 MAXIMUM AWARDS—DIVISIONS I-A, I-AA FOOTBALL

A. Bylaws: Amend Article 6, Section 5-(c), page 133, as follows:
[Division I-A football only]

"(c) Division I-A Football—There shall be an annual limit of 30 for the 1988-89 academic year and 25 thereafter on the initial financial aid awards that may be made to student-athletes, and there shall be an annual limit of 95 on the total number of financial aid awards that may be in effect the same year, including initial awards, except that a financial aid award for a student-athlete who graduates at midyear may be replaced by an initial financial aid award. Such an initial award shall count toward the appropriate initial-awards limitation for the following academic year. **Further, a student-athlete who has been in residence at the certifying institution for at least two academic years may receive athletically related financial aid for the first time without such aid counting as an initial award, provided the aid falls within the overall grant limitation.**"

B. Bylaws: Amend Article 6, Section 5-(d), page 133, as follows:
[Division I-AA football only]

"(d) Division I-AA Football—There shall be an annual limit of 30 on the number of initial financial aid awards that may be made to student-athletes, and there shall be an annual limit of 70 on the value of financial aid awards in effect the same year, including initial awards. The maximum awards may not be distributed to more than 95 student-athletes. **A student-athlete who has been in residence at the certifying institution for at least two academic years may receive athletically related financial aid for the first time without such aid counting as an initial award, provided the aid falls within the overall grant limitation.**"

Source: NCAA Council.

Intent: To permit Divisions I-A and I-AA to award athletically related financial aid to a football student-athlete for the first time and exempt such aid from the initial grant limitation if the student-athlete has been in residence at the certifying institution for at least two academic years.

A-64 _____ 1989 Convention Proceedings

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: Part B approved by Division I-AA. Part A defeated by Division I-A. First approved by Division I-A, 61-45; later defeated after motion to reconsider approved.

NO. 64 GRADUATE ASSISTANT COACHES

Bylaws: Amend Article 7, Section 1-(h), page 140, as follows:
[Division I only]

"(h) Any individual who has received a baccalaureate degree and is enrolled in the institution in at least 50 percent of the institution's minimum regular graduate program of studies may assist in coaching subject to the limitations on number of graduate assistant coaches, provided the individual's remuneration is limited to the value of commonly accepted educational expenses and the receipt of four complimentary tickets to the institution's intercollegiate football and basketball games, **and the Graduate and postgraduate financial assistance administered outside the institution (e.g., NCAA postgraduate scholarship) shall be excluded from the individual's limit on remuneration, provided such assistance is awarded through an established and continuing program to aid graduate students and the donor of the assistance does not restrict the recipient's choice of institutions.** An individual *does* may not serve as a graduate assistant coach in accordance with the provisions of this paragraph at a particular member institution for a period of more than two years. The member institution is prohibited from arranging additional employment opportunities for such a graduate assistant coach. The Council, by a two-thirds majority of its members present and voting, may approve exceptions to the two-year limitation based on bona fide academic reasons. There shall be a limit of five graduate assistant coaches (in combination with the volunteer assistant coach in Division I-AA) in football and two (in combination with volunteer assistant coaches) in basketball."

Source: NCAA Council (Committee on Financial Aid and Amateurism).

Intent: To permit a graduate assistant coach to receive financial assistance administered outside the institution without counting such assistance in the limit on remuneration, provided such assistance is awarded through an established and continuing program to aid graduate students and the donor does not restrict the recipient's choice of institutions.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: Approved by Division I.

NO. 65 MAXIMUM AWARDS—DIVISION I WOMEN'S VOLLEYBALL

A. Bylaws: Amend Article 6, Section 5-(f), page 134, as follows:

Legislative Proposals _____ A-65

[Division I only]

"(f) Division I Women's Gymnastics, and Women's Tennis and Women's Volleyball—Following are the annual limits on the total number of financial aid awards that may be in effect in the same year in each sport.

Gymnastics	10	Tennis	8	Volleyball	12"
------------	----	--------	---	------------	-----

B. Bylaws: Amend Article 6, Section 5, by adding new paragraph (g), page 134, relettering subsequent paragraphs, as follows:

[Division I only]

"(g) Division I Women's Volleyball—There shall be an annual limit of 12 on the total number of financial aid awards that may be in effect the same year, except that a financial aid award for a student-athlete who graduates at midyear may be replaced by a financial aid award to another student-athlete without such award counting as an additional award in the same academic year."

Source: University of New Mexico; New Mexico State University; Southern Illinois University, Carbondale; University of Texas, Austin; University of Texas, El Paso; University of Utah, and two other member institutions.

Intent: To permit the replacement of a midyear graduate in Division I women's volleyball without being required to count the assistance given the replacement student-athlete as a separate financial aid award until the succeeding academic year.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: Approved by Division I.

NO. 66 MAXIMUM AWARDS—DIVISION II FOOTBALL

Bylaws: Amend Article 6, Section 5-(h), page 134, as follows:

[Division II football only]

"(h) Division II—Following are the maximum awards that may be in effect at any one time: [Note: A Division II member institution electing to exceed the limitations of this paragraph in a sport or sports is governed by the provisions of Bylaw 5-6-(g).]

"(1) For men's sports:

"Football 40 35"

Source: All eight members of the Great Lakes Intercollegiate Athletic Conference and six other member institutions.

Intent: To reduce from 40 to 35 the number of financial aid awards (based on equivalencies) in Division II football.

Effective Date: August 1, 1990.

Action: Defeated by Division II, 39-67.

NO. 67 MAXIMUM AWARDS—DIVISION II FOOTBALL

Bylaws: Amend Article 6, Section 5-(h), page 134, as follows:

A-66 _____ 1989 Convention Proceedings

[Division II football only]

"(h) Division II—Following are the maximum awards that may be in effect at any one time: [Note: A Division II member institution electing to exceed the limitations of this paragraph in a sport or sports is governed by the provisions of Bylaw 5-6-(g).]

"(1) For men's sports:

"Football 40 [plus five additional grant-in-aid awards that may include countable financial aid per O.I. 600, but for which there is on file in the office of the director of athletics certification by the faculty athletics representative, the admissions officer and the director of financial aid that the student's financial aid was granted without regard in any degree to athletic ability.]"

Source: Augustana College (South Dakota); Morningside College; University of Nebraska, Omaha; University of North Dakota; North Dakota State University; University of Northern Colorado, and one other member institution.

Intent: To increase the number of financial aid awards in Division II football from 40 to 45, it being understood that the additional five grant-in-aid awards may include countable institutional (but not athletically related) financial aid per O.I. 600.

Effective Date: August 1, 1989.

Action: Defeated by Division II.

NO. 68 DIVISION III—COST OF ATTENDANCE

Bylaws: Amend Article 6, Section 1-(a), page 129, as follows:

[Division III only]

"Section 1. Amount of Financial Aid. (a) A student-athlete shall not be eligible to participate in intercollegiate athletics if he or she receives financial aid that exceeds the value of tuition and fees, room and board, and required course-related books. In addition, a Division III student-athlete shall be eligible to receive financial aid related to transportation and other expenses incidental to attendance, provided the total value of all financial aid does not exceed the cost of attendance that normally is incurred by students enrolled in a comparable program at that institution."

Source: NCAA Council (Division III Steering Committee).

Intent: To specify that a Division III student-athlete shall be eligible to receive financial aid related to transportation and other expenses incidental to attendance, provided the total value of all financial aid does not exceed the cost of attendance that normally is incurred by students enrolled in a comparable program at that institution.

Effective Date: August 1, 1989.

Action: Approved by Division III.

Legislative Proposals _____ A-67

General

NO. 69 RESOLUTION: REVISION OF NCAA MANUAL

[All divisions, common vote]

"Whereas, the Special NCAA Committee on Deregulation and Rules Simplification has reorganized and has rewritten portions of the NCAA Manual to clarify and simplify the Manual's language; and

"Whereas, the revised Manual significantly simplifies and clarifies existing legislation; and

"Whereas, the content of the revised Manual will benefit the membership by making NCAA legislation easier to locate, interpret, implement and amend;

"Now, Therefore, Be It Resolved, that the NCAA membership adopt the revised Manual, effective upon adjournment of the 1989 NCAA Convention; and

"Be it Further Resolved, that those legislative amendments drafted pursuant to the style of the existing Manual that are approved during the 1989 Convention will be rewritten consistent with the editorial style and format of the revised Manual and incorporated therein."

Source: NCAA Council (Special Committee on Deregulation and Rules Simplification).

Action: Approved.

NO. 70 RESOLUTION: INTERPRETATION OF REVISED NCAA MANUAL

[All divisions, common vote]

"Whereas, in an effort to clarify and simplify the NCAA Manual, the Special NCAA Committee on Deregulation and Rules Simplification has reorganized and rewritten the Association's legislation; and

"Whereas, the intent of the NCAA Council and of the Special Committee on Deregulation and Rules Simplification has been to retain the meaning and substantive content of current legislation; and

"Whereas, the committee has had the benefit of assistance by many individuals from member institutions and organizations in reviewing the various articles of the revised Manual; and

"Whereas, the Council has monitored the work of the committee and has reviewed selected articles of the revised Manual during the progress of this effort and believes that extraordinary care has been exercised to achieve the above objectives; and

"Whereas, it is possible that the committee inadvertently may have rewritten some legislation inconsistent with its meaning set forth in the 1988-89 Manual and in published interpretations; and

"Whereas, in these limited cases, sufficient documentation and evidence may be available to establish clearly that the wording of certain sections of the revised Manual is inconsistent with the estab-

lished meaning;

"Now, Therefore, Be It Resolved, that after the adoption of the revised Manual, the Council be authorized during the first year of use to interpret, revise and publish (in The NCAA News) wording consistent with its established meaning when evidence clearly indicates that the revised wording is inconsistent with that meaning; and

"Be It Further Resolved, that the Council be required to sponsor legislation at the next annual Convention to confirm any such interpretations and revisions."

Source: NCAA Council (Special Committee on Deregulation and Rules Simplification).

Action: Approved.

NO. 71 FACULTY ATHLETICS REPRESENTATIVE

Constitution: Amend Article 3, Section 2, by adding new paragraph (b), page 18, relettering subsequent paragraphs, as follows:

[All divisions, common vote]

"(b) A member institution shall designate an individual to serve as faculty athletics representative. An individual so designated after January 12, 1989, shall be a member of the institution's faculty or an administrator who holds faculty rank and shall not hold an administrative or coaching position in the athletics department. A faculty athletics representative shall be responsible for certifying the eligibility of student-athletes for participation in intercollegiate athletics. Other duties of the faculty athletics representative shall be determined by the member institution."

Source: Centre College, University of Connecticut, Furman University, Oberlin College, Syracuse University, University of Washington and three other member institutions.

Intent: To specify that member institutions shall designate individuals to serve as faculty athletics representatives; to specify that faculty athletics representatives subsequently designated after this legislation becomes effective (January 12, 1989) shall be faculty members or administrators who hold faculty rank and shall not hold administrative or coaching positions in the member institution's athletics department; to specify that faculty athletics representatives shall be responsible for certifying student-athlete eligibility for participation in intercollegiate athletics, and to affirm that member institutions designate other duties of faculty athletics representatives.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: Approved as amended by No. 71-1.

NO. 71-1 FACULTY ATHLETICS REPRESENTATIVE

Amend Proposal No. 71, Constitution 3-2-(b), page 59, as follows:

Legislative Proposals

A-69

[All divisions, common vote]

"(b) A member institution shall designate an individual to serve as faculty athletics representative. An individual so designated after January 12, 1989, shall be a member of the institution's faculty or an administrator who holds faculty rank and shall not hold an administrative or coaching position in the athletics department. A faculty athletics representative shall be responsible for certifying the eligibility of student-athletes for participation in intercollegiate athletics. Other Duties of the faculty athletics representative shall be determined by the member institution."

Source: University of Iowa.

Action: Approved.

NO. 72 BYLAWS WAIVER

Constitution: Amend Article 5, Section 1-(g), page 39, as follows:

[All divisions, common vote]

"(g) In addition to being responsible for establishing and directing the Association's general policies between Conventions, the Council may adopt administrative regulations for the efficient implementation of the Association's general legislative policies. **Between annual Conventions, the Council may grant waivers of the Association's bylaws if, by a two-thirds majority of its members present and voting, it determines that such waivers are warranted by equitable circumstances that are consistent with the intent of the Association's bylaws.**"

Source: Butler University, University of Dayton, University of Detroit, University of Evansville, Loyola University (Illinois), St. Louis University and one other member of the Midwestern Collegiate Conference.

Intent: To specify that between annual Conventions, the NCAA Council may grant waivers of the Association's bylaws based upon equitable circumstances that are consistent with the intent of the bylaws.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: Withdrawn.

NO. 73 CONDITION OF MEMBERSHIP—VIOLATIONS REPORT

Constitution: Amend Article 4, Section 2-(a), page 30, as follows:

[All divisions, common vote]

"(a) To administer their athletics programs in accordance with the constitution, the bylaws and other legislation of the Association; **further, each member institution promptly shall file with the NCAA enforcement department and the applicable conference office a written report regarding all violations of such legislation in which it is involved.**"

A-70 _____ 1989 Convention Proceedings

Source: University of Cincinnati, University of Louisville, Memphis State University, University of South Carolina, University of Southern Mississippi and Virginia Polytechnic Institute.

Intent: To clarify that each member institution promptly shall file with the NCAA enforcement department and the applicable conference office a written report regarding all violations of NCAA legislation in which it is involved.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: Withdrawn.

NO. 74 OFF-SEASON DRUG TESTING

Bylaws: Amend Article 5, Section 2-(d), pages 118-119, as follows:

[Divided bylaw, all divisions, divided vote]

"(d) In the sport of football **and in other sports as determined by the institution**, and on a voluntary basis with the institution, the NCAA may test a member institution's student-athletes for the use of anabolic steroids between January 1 and the end of the member institution's academic year. The Association shall utilize the drug-testing methods established pursuant to Executive Regulation 1-7 on a random-selection basis in the administration of this legislation, and the NCAA shall pay the costs. Any use of anabolic steroids by student-athletes discovered pursuant to this program shall be reported to the member institution upon its request, but no individual or institutional ineligibility sanctions shall be applied by the NCAA."

Source: All nine members of the Southwest Athletic Conference.

Intent: To permit the NCAA to test student-athletes in sports other than football as a part of the Association's voluntary, off-season steroid testing program.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: Approved by all divisions.

NO. 75 SPONSORSHIP—AMENDMENTS TO AMENDMENTS

A. Constitution: Amend Article 7, Section 3, page 53, as follows:

[All divisions, common vote]

"Section 3. A proposed amendment to the constitution may be amended at a Convention by a majority of the members present and voting, provided that the amendment to the proposed amendment does not increase the modification of the constitutional provision to be amended, and provided further that the amendment to the proposed amendment shall have been submitted in writing to the secretary prior to 1 p.m. on the day preceding the division business sessions **and shall be sponsored by a total of five active member institutions.** The secretary shall prepare copies of the amendment to the proposed amend-

Legislative Proposals _____ A-71

ment for distribution before or during the business sessions."

B. Bylaws: Amend Article 13, Section 3, page 186, as follows:

[Common bylaw, all divisions, divided vote]

"Section 3. A proposed amendment to the bylaws may be amended at a Convention by a majority vote of the members present and voting, provided that the amendment to the proposed amendment does not increase the modification of the bylaw provision to be amended, and provided further that the amendment to the proposed amendment shall have been submitted in writing to the secretary prior to 1 p.m. on the day preceding the division business sessions **and shall be sponsored by a total of five active member institutions.** The secretary shall prepare copies of the amendment to the proposed amendment for distribution before or during the business sessions."

Source: NCAA Council (Special Subcommittee on the Incorporation of Interpretations and Legislation in the NCAA Manual).

Intent: To increase the minimum sponsorship requirement for an amendment to an amendment from one to five active member institutions.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: Moot due to approval of No. 48.

NO. 76 LEGISLATIVE REVIEW COMMITTEE

Bylaws: Amend Article 12, Section 3, by adding new paragraph (k), page 173, relettering subsequent paragraphs, as follows:

[Common bylaw, all divisions, divided vote]

"(k) **The Legislative Review Committee shall consist of five members, including three from Division I and one each from Divisions II and III. One position shall be allocated for a man, one allocated for a woman and three unallocated. It shall review and refine legislative proposals, incorporate new legislation and interpretations in the NCAA Manual, review deregulation issues in consultation with other Association committees, and approve the publication of supplementary compilations of interpretations.**"

Source: NCAA Council (Special Subcommittee on the Incorporation of Interpretations and Legislation in the NCAA Manual).

Intent: To establish a Legislative Review Committee to review and refine legislative proposals, incorporate new legislation and interpretations in the NCAA Manual, review deregulation issues in consultation with other Association committees, and approve the publication of supplementary compilations of interpretations. [Estimated annual cost to the Association: \$15,000.]

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: Approved by all divisions.

NO. 77 STUDENT-ATHLETE ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Bylaws: Amend Article 12, Section 3, by adding new paragraph (r), page 174, relettering subsequent paragraph; as follows:

[Common bylaw, all divisions, divided vote]

"(r) **The Student-Athlete Advisory Committee shall consist of 16 members, including eight from Division I, four from Division II and four from Division III. Five positions shall be allocated for male student-athletes, five positions shall be allocated for female student-athletes and six shall be unallocated. Each of the four regions in each division shall receive equal representation. A member shall not serve more than two years on the committee. Student-athletes may serve on the committee up to two years after the completion of their intercollegiate athletics eligibility. Three Council members (one from each division) shall serve as ex officio members of the committee. The committee shall receive information on and explanations of NCAA activities and legislation and, in consultation with former NCAA officers, shall review and react to topics referred to it by other Association committees and the NCAA Council.**"

Source: NCAA Council.

Intent: To establish a Student-Athlete Advisory Committee to receive information on and explanations of NCAA activities and legislation and, in consultation with former NCAA officers, to review and react to topics referred to it by other Association committees and the NCAA Council. [Estimated annual cost to the Association: \$16,000.]

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: Approved by all divisions.

NO. 78 BASEBALL RULES AND DIVISION BASEBALL COMMITTEES

A. Bylaws: Amend Article 12, Section 5-(a), pages 175-176, as follows:

[Common bylaw, all divisions, divided vote]

"(a) The following are the sports committees with responsibilities for formulating the official playing rules in their respective sports.

"Baseball Rules

[Subparagraphs (1) through (3) unchanged.]

"(4) The secretary-rules editor of each of the following committees may be reelected without restriction: **Baseball Rules, Men's Basketball Rules, Men's Fencing, Football Rules, Men's Ice Hockey, Men's Lacrosse, Men's and Women's Rifle, Men's Soccer, Men's and Women's Swimming, Men's and Women's Track and Field, Men's Water Polo, and Wrestling.** Except for the Men's Basketball Rules

and Football Rules Committees, the secretary-rules editor shall be a nonvoting member of the committee.

[Subparagraph (5) unchanged.]

"(6) In accordance with the provisions of Constitution 5-8, the sports committees (except the **Baseball Rules**, **Football Rules**, **Men's Basketball Rules** and **Women's Basketball Rules**) listed above shall develop policies and procedures governing the administration and conduct of the NCAA championships in their respective sports, subject to the approval of the Executive Committee."

[Subparagraph (7) unchanged.]

B. Bylaws: Amend Article 12, Section 5-(b), pages 176-177, as follows:

[Common bylaw, all divisions, divided vote]

"(b) The **Baseball Rules** Committee shall consist of **13 nine** members and shall be constituted as follows:

"(1) At least two representatives from each of the following geographical regions: (i) Districts 1 and 2, (ii) District 3, (iii) Districts 4 and 5 and (iv) Districts 6, 7 and 8;

"(2) (1) **Six Four** members shall be from Division I, **three two** members shall be from Division II, **three two** members shall be from Division III and an additional member shall be secretary-rules editor; and

"(2) **One** member shall be elected chair.

"(3) Committee shall act as one body to formulate playing rules and determine general policies for Divisions I, II and III championships in baseball, with division subcommittees composed of committee members from the respective divisions responsible for administering the respective division championships."

C. Bylaws: Amend Article 12, Section 6-(a), pages 180-181, as follows:

[Common bylaw, all divisions, divided vote]

"(a) The following are the sports committees with responsibilities solely for the administration and conduct of the particular championship for the respective divisions:

"Division I Baseball

"Division II Baseball

"Division III Baseball"

D. Bylaws: Amend Article 12, Section 6, by adding new paragraphs (b), (c) and (d), page 181, relettering subsequent paragraphs, as follows:

[Common bylaw, all divisions, divided vote]

"(b) The **Division I Baseball Committee** shall consist of **nine** representatives from Division I, including one member from each of the eight Division I baseball regions and one selected at large. The **Division I Baseball Advisory Committees** shall be appointed by the Division I

Baseball Committee as prescribed by the Executive Committee.

"(c) The **Division II Baseball Committee** shall consist of **six** members. The **Division II Baseball Advisory Committees** shall be appointed by the **Division II Baseball Committee** as prescribed by the Executive Committee.

"(d) The **Division III Baseball Committee** shall consist of **six** members. The **Division III Baseball Advisory Committees** shall be appointed by the **Division III Baseball Committee** as prescribed by the Executive Committee."

Source: NCAA Council (Executive Committee).

Intent: To establish the Baseball Rules Committee to formulate official playing rules in baseball and to establish Divisions I, II and III Baseball Committees to administer and conduct baseball championships in the respective divisions. [Estimated annual cost to the Association: \$17,500.]

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: Approved by all divisions.

NO. 79 ICE HOCKEY RULES AND DIVISIONS I AND III ICE HOCKEY COMMITTEES

A. Bylaws: Amend Article 12, Section 5-(a), pages 175-176, as follows:

[Common bylaw, all divisions, divided vote]

"(a) The following are the sports committees with responsibilities for formulating the official playing rules in their respective sports.

"Men's Ice Hockey Rules

[Subparagraphs (1) through (3) unchanged.]

"(4) The secretary-rules editor of each of the following committees may be reelected without restriction: **Baseball**, **Men's Basketball Rules**, **Men's Fencing**, **Football Rules**, **Men's Ice Hockey Rules**, **Men's Lacrosse**, **Men's and Women's Rifle**, **Men's Soccer**, **Men's and Women's Swimming**, **Men's and Women's Track and Field**, **Men's Water Polo**, and **Wrestling**. Except for the **Men's Basketball Rules** and **Football Rules Committees**, the secretary-rules editor shall be a nonvoting member of the committee.

[Subparagraph (5) unchanged.]

"(6) In accordance with the provisions of Constitution 5-8, the sports committees (except the **Football Rules**, **Men's Basketball Rules**, and **Women's Basketball Rules** and **Men's Ice Hockey Rules**) listed above shall develop policies and procedures governing the administration and conduct of the NCAA championships in their respective sports, subject to the approval of the Executive Committee."

[Subparagraph (7) unchanged.]

- B. Bylaws:** Amend Article 12, Section 5-(g), pages 177-178, as follows:

[Common bylaw, all divisions, divided vote]

"(g) The Men's Ice Hockey Rules Committee shall consist of ~~nine~~ **seven** members and shall be constituted as follows:

"(1) **Two Four** representatives members shall be from each of the following geographical regions representing Division I: (i) the East, comprising Districts 1 and 2, and (ii) the West, comprising Districts 4, 5, 7 and 8; **and two members shall be from Division III, and**

"(2) Two representatives from each of the following geographical regions representing Divisions II and III, with each division to be represented: (i) the East, comprising Districts 1 and 2, and (ii) the West, comprising Districts 4, 5, 7 and 8.

"(3) **An** additional member shall be secretary-rules editor.

"(2) **One member shall be elected chair.**

"(3) Committee shall act as one body to formulate playing rules and determine general policies for Divisions I and III men's championships in ice hockey, with division subcommittees composed of committee members from the respective divisions responsible for administering the respective division championships."

- C. Bylaws:** Amend Article 12, Section 6-(a), pages 180-181, as follows:

[Common bylaw, all divisions, divided vote]

"(a) The following are the sports committees with responsibilities solely for the administration and conduct of the particular championship for the respective divisions:

"Division I Men's Ice Hockey

"Division III Men's Ice Hockey"

- D. Bylaws:** Amend Article 12, Section 6, by adding new paragraphs (p) and (q), page 183, relettering subsequent paragraphs, as follows:

[Common bylaw, all divisions, divided vote]

"(p) **The Division I Men's Ice Hockey Committee shall consist of four representatives from Division I, including two members from the East, comprising Districts 1, 2 and 3, and two members from the West, comprising Districts 4, 5, 6, 7 and 8. The Division I Men's Ice Hockey Advisory Committees shall be appointed by the Division I Men's Ice Hockey Committee as prescribed by the Executive Committee.**

"(q) **The Division III Men's Ice Hockey Committee shall consist of four representatives from Division III, including two members from the East, comprising Districts 1, 2 and 3; two members from the West, comprising Districts 4, 5, 6, 7 and 8, and one member elected at**

large. The Division III Men's Ice Hockey Advisory Committees shall be appointed by the Division III Men's Ice Hockey Committee as prescribed by the Executive Committee."

Source: NCAA Council (Executive Committee).

Intent: To establish the Men's Ice Hockey Rules Committee to formulate official playing rules in the sport of ice hockey and to establish the Divisions I and III Men's Ice Hockey Committees to administer and conduct ice hockey championships in the respective divisions. [Estimated annual cost to the Association: \$6,800.]

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: Approved by all divisions.

NO. 80 MEN'S AND WOMEN'S SOCCER RULES COMMITTEE

- A. Bylaws:** Amend Article 12, Section 5-(a), pages 175-176, as follows:

[Common bylaw, all divisions, divided vote]

"(a) The following are the sports committees with responsibilities for formulating the official playing rules in their respective sports.

"Men's and Women's Soccer Rules

[Subparagraphs (1) through (3) unchanged.]

"(4) The secretary-rules editor of each of the following committees may be reelected without restriction: Baseball, Men's Basketball Rules, Men's Fencing, Football Rules, Men's Ice Hockey, Men's Lacrosse, Men's and Women's Rifle, **Men's and Women's Soccer Rules**, Men's and Women's Swimming, Men's and Women's Track and Field, Men's Water Polo, and Wrestling. Except for the Men's Basketball Rules and Football Rules Committees, the secretary-rules editor shall be a nonvoting member of the committee.

[Subparagraph (5) unchanged.]

"(6) In accordance with the provisions of Constitution 5-8, the sports committees (except the Football Rules, Men's Basketball Rules, and Women's Basketball Rules, **and Men's and Women's Soccer Rules**) listed above shall develop policies and procedures governing the administration and conduct of the NCAA championships in their respective sports, subject to the approval of the Executive Committee."

- B. Bylaws:** Amend Article 12, Section 5-(k), page 178, by deleting the present language and substituting new paragraph (k), as follows:

[Common bylaw, all divisions, divided vote]

"(k) **The Men's and Women's Soccer Rules Committee shall consist of nine members and shall be constituted as follows:**

"(1) Four members shall be from Division I, two members shall be from Division II and two members shall be from Division III;

"(2) Within each division, one-half of the members shall represent men's soccer interests and one-half of the members shall represent women's soccer interests, and

"(3) One of the members shall be elected chair and one additional member shall be elected secretary-rules editor."

C. Bylaws: Amend Article 12, Section 6, pages 180-183, as follows:

[Common bylaw, all divisions, divided vote]

"(a) The following are the sports committees with responsibilities solely for the administration and conduct of the particular championship for the respective divisions:

"Men's Soccer

[Subparagraphs (1) through (3) and paragraphs (b) through (p) unchanged.]

"(q) The Men's Soccer Committee shall consist of 12 members, including not more than one representative from any men's soccer region in any division; six members from Division I, three members from Division II and three members from Division III."

[Paragraphs (q) through (w), relettered as (r) through (x), unchanged.]

Source: NCAA Council (Executive Committee).

Intent: To establish a joint NCAA Men's and Women's Soccer Rules Committee with playing-rules responsibilities and to assign responsibility for the administration of soccer championships matters to the Men's Soccer Committee and the Women's Soccer Committee. [Estimated annual cost to the Association: \$8,000.]

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: Approved by all divisions.

NO. 81 DIVISION II FOOTBALL COMMITTEE

Bylaws: Amend Article 12, Section 6-(k), page 182, as follows:

[Common bylaw, all divisions, divided vote]

"(k) The Division II Football Committee shall consist of *four* **eight** members. One member shall be elected from each of the four Division II football regions and **four** members shall be **elected at large**. The Division II Football Advisory Committees shall be appointed by the Division II Football Committee as prescribed by the Executive Committee."

Source: All eight members of the Lone Star Conference.

Intent: To increase from four to eight the membership of the

A-78 _____ 1989 Convention Proceedings

Division II Football Committee.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: Withdrawn.

Recruiting

[Note: Also see Proposal Nos. 143 and 145 in the Deregulation/Simplification grouping.]

NO. 82 PROSPECTIVE STUDENT-ATHLETE

A. Bylaws: Amend O.I.s 100 and 101, following Article 1, Section 1-(a), page 55, as follows:

[All divisions, common vote]

"O.I. 100. A prospective student becomes a prospective 'student-athlete' (i.e., matriculation is considered not to have been solicited) if **the individual has started classes for the ninth grade** and a member of the athletics staff or other representative of athletics interests: (i) provides transportation to the prospective student to visit its campus; (ii) entertains the prospective student in any way on the campus, except the institution may make available to the prospect a complimentary admission to an athletics contest when the prospect visits the institution as a member of a group tour; (iii) initiates or arranges a telephone contact with the prospective student or member of the student's family (or guardian) for the purpose of recruitment; (iv) visits a prospective student or member of the student's family (or guardian) for the purpose of recruitment, or (v) entertains members of the family (or guardian) of a prospective student on its campus.

"O.I. 101. **Matriculation of an individual who has started classes for the ninth grade** is considered not to have been solicited if a member of the athletics staff or other representative of athletics interests: (i) comes in normal contact (without prearrangement) with a prospective student or members of the student's family (or guardian) and exhibits normal civility excluding any attempts to recruit the prospect, or (ii) requests via mail a prospective student or a member of the student's family (or guardian) to complete and return a questionnaire relative to the student's high school, preparatory school or junior college record."

B. Bylaws: Amend Article 1, Section 1, by adding new paragraph (b), page 56, relettering subsequent paragraphs, as follows:

[All divisions, common vote]

"(b) **A member institution's recruitment of an individual who has not started classes for the ninth grade shall be governed by the principle that the institution may not provide such an individual (or the individual's relatives or friends) any financial aid or other benefits that the**

Legislative Proposals _____ A-79

institution does not provide to prospective students generally."

C. Bylaws: Amend Article 1, Section 6-(c), page 67, as follows:

[All divisions, common vote]

"(c) For the purposes of the tryout rule only, the phrase 'prospective student-athlete' shall include any individual who has started classes for the ninth grade or has had his or her 15th birthday, whichever comes first, and is not enrolled in the institution at the time of the practice or test therein described."

Source: NCAA Council (Recruiting Committee).

Intent: To define a "prospective student-athlete" for Bylaw 1 purposes as any individual who has started classes for the ninth grade and to specify that a member institution's recruitment of an individual who has not started classes for the ninth grade shall be governed by the principle that the institution may not provide such an individual (or the individual's relatives or friends) any financial aid or other benefits that the institution does not provide to prospective students generally.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: Approved.

NO. 83 CONTACT RESTRICTIONS

Bylaws: Amend Article 1, Section 2-(g), page 62, as follows:

[Divided bylaw, all divisions, divided vote]

"(g) No contact with a prospective student-athlete shall be made at the site of prior to any a school's athletics competition when the prospect is a participant therein during the day or days of the competition. 'Contact' with a prospect 'at the site of a school's the athletics competition' (high school, college preparatory school or junior college) shall be governed by the following:"

[Subparagraphs (1) through (4) unchanged.]

Source: NCAA Council (Recruiting Committee).

Intent: To apply the contact restrictions outlined in Bylaw 1-2-(g) to any athletics competition in which a prospective student-athlete is a participant, regardless of the site of the competition. [Note: Case No. 196 will be deleted upon the adoption of this proposal.]

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: Approved by all divisions.

NO. 84 RECRUITING CONTACTS AND EVALUATION ACTIVITIES

A. Bylaws: Amend Article 1, Section 2-(f), page 62, as follows:

[Division I only]

"(f) No in-person contact shall be made by members of the coaching staff of a member institution on or off its campus with a prospective student-athlete at the site of practice or competition for a high school all star game any athletics event outside the

permissible contact periods in the sports of football [per Bylaw 1-2-(a)-(5)] and basketball [per Bylaws 1-2-(a)-(6) and (7)]."

B. Bylaws: Amend Article 1, Section 3, by adding new paragraph (h), page 65, as follows:

[Division I only]

"(h) Such scouting activities shall not be permissible by members of the coaching staff of a member institution on or off its campus at the site of practice or competition for any athletics event outside the permissible contact or evaluation periods in the sports of football [per Bylaws 1-2-(a)-(5) and 1-3-(e)] and basketball [per Bylaws 1-2-(a)-(6), 1-2-(a)-(7), 1-3-(a), 1-3-(b), 1-3-(c) and 1-3-(d)], except when the prospective student-athlete is participating on the member institution's campus in a sport other than football or basketball."

Source: NCAA Division I Steering Committee.

Intent: To prohibit in-person contact with and evaluation of prospective student-athletes by a Division I member institution's coaching staff on or off the campus in conjunction with any athletics event involving prospective student-athletes in the sports of football and basketball, unless such contact or evaluation occurs within the permissible contact or evaluation periods for those sports, it being understood that evaluation (but not contact) is permitted if such a prospective student-athlete is participating on the member institution's campus in a sport other than football or basketball.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: Approved by Division I.

NO. 85 SUMMER SPORTS CAMPS AND SUMMER CLINICS

A. Bylaws: Amend Article 1, Section 7, pages 69-70, as follows:

[Divided bylaw, all divisions, divided vote]

"Section 7. Summer Sports Camps, Coaching Schools and Summer Clinics. (a) Any summer sports camp, coaching school or instructional summer clinic that (1) is operated by a member institution either on or off its campus or (2) involves one or more of the institution's athletics department personnel on a full- or part-time basis, or (3) utilizes the institution's facilities, is owned or operated by a member institution or an employee of the member institution's athletics department, either on or off its campus, is considered to be the institution's summer sports camp, or summer clinic or school.

"(b) A summer sports camp or summer clinic shall be one that places special emphasis on a particular sport or sports and provides specialized instruction, practice or competition, or is a camp or clinic that offers a diversified experience without emphasis on instruction, practice or competition in any particular sport. Such a camp

or clinic may be conducted only during the institution's summer vacation period. Any clinics conducted outside of the institution's summer vacation period must meet the provisions regarding developmental clinics outlined in NCAA Bylaw 1-6-(d)-(1).

"(c) In all divisions, no athletics department staff member may be employed (either on a salaried or volunteer basis) by any camp or clinic established, sponsored or conducted by an individual or organization that provides recruiting or scouting services concerning prospective student-athletes. In Division I only, no athletics department staff member may be employed (either on a salaried or volunteer basis) by or lecture at a noninstitutional basketball or football camp or clinic.

"(b) (d) A member institution's summer sports camp, coaching school or summer clinic shall be open to any and all entrants (limited only by number and age) except that a senior prospective student-athlete shall not be permitted to enroll, participate or be employed at such a summer sports camp or summer clinic or coaching school other than those developmental clinics outlined in Bylaw 1-6-(d)-(1). For purposes of this legislation, a 'senior prospective student-athlete' is one who is eligible for admission to a member institution or who has started classes for the senior year in high school.

"(c) A member institution's sports camp, coaching school or clinic shall involve activities designed to improve overall skills and general knowledge in the sport.

"(d) (e) In operating a specialized summer sports camp, coaching school or summer clinic, a member institution, an member employee of its staff the member institution's athletics department or a representative of its the member institution's athletics interests shall not employ or give free or reduced admission privileges to a high school or junior college athletics award winner any individual who has started classes for the ninth grade.

"O.I. 103. A specialized sports camp shall be one that places special emphasis on a particular sport or sports and provides specialized instruction, practice and usually competition.

"O.I. 104. A diversified sports camp shall be one that offers a balanced camping experience, including participation in seasonal summer sports and recreational activities, without emphasis on instruction, practice or competition in any particular sport.

"(e) No intercollegiate football or men's basketball squad member with eligibility remaining at a particular member institution may be employed or otherwise participate in that institution's camp specializing in the student-athlete's sport.

"(f) A member institution (or employees of its athletics personnel department) may employ a its student-athletes as a counselors in a diversified summer sports camps or summer clinics, except not more than one member (with eligibility remaining) of the previous year's intercollegiate football squad and not more than one member (with eligibility remaining) of the previous year's intercollegiate men's basketball squad may be so employed

A-82 _____ 1989 Convention Proceedings

subject to the following restrictions:

"(1) The student-athletes shall not participate in organized practice activities;

"(2) The student-athletes' compensation must not exceed the compensation paid to camp counselors or lecturers of equal teaching ability and summer-camp experience, and

"(3) The member institution's director of athletics must give prior approval to the student-athletes' employment arrangement.

"(g) A member institution (or its athletics personnel) may employ another institution's intercollegiate football or men's basketball squad member in its summer camp specializing in the student-athlete's sport, provided the student-athlete who is employed at any summer sports camp or summer clinic must perform duties that are of a general supervisory character and any coaching or officiating assignments shall represent not more than one-half of the student-athlete's work time, and provided not more than one (football or men's basketball) student-athlete of any one institution is employed. Further, the compensation shall be commensurate with the going rate for summer camp or summer clinic counselors of like teaching ability and summer-camp or summer-clinic experience and may not be paid on the basis of the value that the student-athlete may have for the employer because of the athletics reputation or fame the student-athlete has achieved.

"(h) No member of the basketball coaching staff of a member institution may be employed by or lecture at a basketball camp established, sponsored or conducted by an individual or organization that provides recruiting or scouting services concerning prospective student-athletes.

"(h) A member institution (or employees of its athletics department) may employ a high school, prep school or junior college coach at its summer camp or summer clinic, provided the coach receives compensation that is commensurate with the going rate for camp counselors or lecturers of like teaching ability and summer-camp experience. Further, such a coach shall not be paid on the basis of the value the coach may have for the employer because of the coach's reputation or contact with prospective student-athletes."

B. Bylaws: Amend Article 3, Section 4-(c)-(1), page 95, as follows:

[Divided bylaw, Divisions II and III, divided vote]

"(1) Except as otherwise restricted in the bylaws, it shall be permissible for institutional squad members with eligibility remaining in their sport in Divisions II and III institutions to be employed or otherwise participate in sports camps or clinics in their sport and to practice and compete on outside amateur teams in their sport."

C. Bylaws: Amend Article 3, Section 4-(c)-(2) and (3), pages 95-96, as follows:

[Divided bylaw, all divisions, divided vote]

Legislative Proposals _____ A-83

"(2) In the sport of soccer, it shall be permissible for institutional squad members with eligibility remaining in the sport to be employed as counselors in a summer soccer camp and to participate on an outside amateur soccer team during the summer months. No more than six student-athletes from the same institution's soccer program may serve as counselors in the same summer camp or participate on the same outside, amateur soccer team.

"(3) In the sport of ice hockey, it shall be permissible for institutional squad members with eligibility remaining to be employed as counselors in a summer ice hockey camp and to participate on an outside, amateur ice hockey team."

Source: NCAA Council (Recruiting Committee).

Intent: To revise and simplify the Association's sports camp and clinic legislation by defining a member institution's sports camp or clinic as one that is owned or operated by a member institution or an employee of the member institution's athletics department; to limit the conduct of regular institutional sports camps and clinics to the institution's summer vacation period and to require other institutional camps and clinics to be developmental and to meet the provisions of Bylaw 1-6-(d)-(1); to prohibit the employment of any athletics department staff member at a camp or clinic established, sponsored or conducted by an individual or organization that provides recruiting or scouting services concerning prospective student-athletes; to preclude Division I athletics department staff members from being employed by or lecturing at noninstitutional summer camps or summer clinics in the sports of basketball and football; to prohibit any individual who has started classes for the ninth grade (rather than only athletics awards winners) from being employed at or receiving free or reduced admission to an institutional summer sports camp or summer clinic; to eliminate the distinction between diversified and specialized summer sports camps and summer clinics; to permit the employment of student-athletes in all sports at institutional summer sports camps and summer clinics under specified circumstances without numerical limitation; to permit the employment of high school, preparatory school or junior college coaches at institutional summer sports camps or summer clinics only under specified conditions, and to consolidate within Bylaw 1-7 all legislation regarding the employment of eligible student-athletes in institutional summer sports camps and summer clinics.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: Approved by Divisions II (89-60) and III (107-103) and defeated by Division I (89-168), as amended by No. 85-1.

NO. 85-1 SUMMER SPORTS CAMPS AND SUMMER CLINICS

Amend Proposal No. 85-A, Bylaw 1-7, pages 70-73, as follows:
[Divided bylaw, all divisions, divided vote]

A-84 _____ 1989 Convention Proceedings

"Section 7. Summer Sports Camps and Summer Clinics. (a) Any summer sports camp or summer clinic that is owned or operated by a member institution or an employee of the member institution's athletics department, either on or off its campus, is considered to be the institution's summer sports camp or summer clinic.

"(b) A summer sports camp or summer clinic shall be one that places special emphasis on a particular sport or sports and provides specialized instruction, practice or competition, or is a camp or clinic that offers a diversified experience without emphasis on instruction, practice or competition in any particular sport.

"(c) Such a In the sports of basketball and football, an institution's camp or clinic may be conducted only during the institution's summer vacation period. Any clinics conducted outside of the institution's summer vacation period must **unless such activities** meet the provisions regarding developmental clinics outlined in NCAA Bylaw 1-6-(d)-(1).

"(c) (d) In all divisions, no athletics department staff member may be employed (either on a salaried or volunteer basis) by any camp or clinic established, sponsored or conducted by an individual or organization that provides recruiting or scouting services concerning prospective student-athletes. In Division I only, no athletics department staff member may be employed (either on a salaried or volunteer basis) by or lecture at a noninstitutional basketball or football camp or clinic.

"(d) (e) A member institution's summer sports camp or summer clinic shall be open to any and all entrants (limited only by number and age) except that a senior prospective student-athlete shall not be permitted to enroll, participate or be employed at such a summer sports camp or summer clinic other than those developmental clinics outlined in Bylaw 1-6-(d)-(1). For purposes of this legislation, a 'senior prospective student-athlete' is one who is eligible for admission to a member institution or who has started classes for the senior year in high school.

"(e) (f) In operating a summer sports camp or summer clinic, a member institution, an employee of the member institution's athletics department or a representative of the member institution's athletics interests shall not employ or give free or reduced admission privileges to any individual **prospective student-athlete** who has started classes for the ninth grade.

"(f) (g) A member institution (or employees of its athletics department) may employ its student-athletes as counselors in summer sports camps or summer clinics, subject to the following restrictions:

"(1) The student-athletes shall not participate in organized practice activities;

"(2) The student-athletes' compensation must not exceed the compensation paid to camp counselors or lecturers of equal teaching ability and summer-camp experience, and

Legislative Proposals _____ A-85

"(3) The member institution's director of athletics must give prior approval to the student-athletes' employment arrangement.

"(g) (h) A student-athlete who is employed at any summer sports camp or summer clinic must perform duties that are of a general supervisory character and any coaching or officiating assignments shall represent not more than one-half of the student-athlete's work time. Further, the compensation shall be commensurate with the going rate for summer camp or summer clinic counselors of like teaching ability and summer-camp or summer-clinic experience and may not be paid on the basis of the value that the student-athlete may have for the employer because of the athletics reputation or fame the student-athlete has achieved.

"(h) (i) A member institution (or employees of its athletics department) may employ a high school, prep school or junior college coach at its summer camp or summer clinic, provided the coach receives compensation that is commensurate with the going rate for camp counselors or lecturers of like teaching ability and summer-camp experience. Further, such a coach shall not be paid on the basis of the value the coach may have for the employer because of the coach's reputation or contact with prospective student-athletes."

Source: All 10 members of the Pacific-10 Conference.

Action: Approved by all divisions.

NO. 86 TRYOUTS-DEVELOPMENTAL CLINICS

Bylaws: Amend Article 1, Section 6-(d)-(1), pages 67-68, as follows:

[Divided bylaw, all divisions, divided vote]

"(1) Developmental clinics (including competition conducted in conjunction with the clinic) involving prospective student-athletes that are designed to develop fundamental skills in a sport (rather than to refine the abilities of skilled participants in the sport) and that are open to the general public (except for restrictions in age or number of participants), provided such activity is conducted by and subject to the control of the host NCAA member institution, **clinic participants do not receive a recruiting presentation, clinic participants reside in the state in which the host institution is located or within 100 miles of the host institution**, and the activity is approved by the NCAA Council by a two-thirds majority of its members present and voting;"

Source: NCAA Council (Recruiting Committee).

Intent: To specify that developmental-clinic participants shall not receive recruiting presentations and must reside in the state in which the host institution is located or within 100 miles of the host institution.

Effective Date: Immediately.

A-86 _____ 1989 Convention Proceedings

Action: Approved by all divisions.

NO. 87 RECRUITING CONTACTS-DIVISION I-A HEAD COACH

Bylaws: Amend Article 1, Section 2-(a)-(2)-(iii), page 58, as follows:

[Division I-A football only]

"(iii) In Division I-A football, the head coach may contact a prospective student-athlete or the prospect's relatives or legal guardian **away from the grounds of the prospect's educational institution** only during one calendar day. It is permissible for **this the head coach** to contact to occur both **the prospect** at the site of the prospect's educational institution and away from institutional grounds **once during each week of the appropriate contact period**, provided each such contact is countable and occurs within the same calendar day. During such contact, the head coach may be accompanied by an assistant(s) who otherwise is required to observe the restrictions contained in the bylaws."

Source: East Carolina University; University of Maryland, College Park; Memphis State University; University of Southern Mississippi; University of Texas, El Paso; University of Tulsa, and one other member institution.

Intent: To permit the head football coach to visit a prospect one day per calendar week at the prospect's educational institution during the applicable contact period, while continuing to limit the head coach to one visit to the prospect's home during the contact period.

Effective Date: August 1, 1989.

Action: Defeated by Division I-A.

NO. 88 CONTACT AND EVALUATION PERIODS-DIVISION I MEN'S BASKETBALL

A. Bylaws: Amend Article 1, Section 2-(a)-(6), page 60, as follows:

[Division I only]

"(6) Such contacts shall be permissible in the sport of men's basketball in Division I only during the period between September 17 11 and October 7 10, and the period between March 1 4 and March 22, the Saturday and the period beginning at 8 a.m. the first Wednesday following the Division I Men's Basketball Championship game and ending nine days following the initial day for the spring signing of the National Letter of Intent in the sport of basketball, except as prohibited by Bylaw 1-2-(a)-(8). The Council shall have the authority to waive this provision by a two-thirds majority of its members present and voting for institutions with established admissions procedures that utilize acceptance dates subsequent to the normal contact deadline."

B. Bylaws: Amend Article 1, Section 3-(a), page 63, as follows:

Legislative Proposals _____ A-87

[Division I only]

"(a) Such scouting activities shall be permissible in the sport of men's basketball in Division I between July 10 5 and July 31, between December 11 1 and December 31 11, **between January 20 and January 30**, and between February 8 18 and the last day of February. Institutional staff members shall be limited to observing a maximum of four basketball contests in which a prospective student-athlete competes during any academic year. Observing a contest shall count as one of the four permissible observations of each prospective student-athlete on both teams."

Source: NCAA Council (Recruiting Committee).

Intent: To revise the Division I men's basketball contact and evaluation periods to permit such activities on the specified dates without expanding the total number of days during which such activities may occur.

Effective Date: August 1, 1989.

Action: Approved by Division I.

NO. 89 CONTACT AND EVALUATION PERIODS- DIVISION I WOMEN'S BASKETBALL

A. Bylaws: Amend Article 1, Section 2-(a)-(6), page 60, as follows:

[Division I only]

"(6) Such contacts shall be permissible in the sport of **women's** basketball in Division I only during the period between September 17 and October 7 and the period between March 1 and the Saturday following the initial day for the spring signing of the National Letter of Intent in the sport of basketball **April 16**, except as prohibited by Bylaw 1-2-(a)-(8). The Council shall have the authority to waive this provision by a two-thirds majority of its members present and voting for institutions with established admissions procedures that utilize acceptance dates subsequent to the normal contact deadline."

B. Bylaws: Amend Article 1, Section 3-(b), pages 63-64, as follows:

[Division I only]

"(b) Such scouting activities shall be permissible in the sport of women's basketball in Division I between July 10 8 and July 31, between December 11 1 and December 31 15, **between January 17 and January 24**, between February 8 and the last day of February, and during the National Junior College Athletic Association and Amateur Athletic Union women's national basketball championship competitions, **and during official tryouts for the ABAUSA Olympic Festival.**

"(1) In those states that play the high school basketball season in the fall, such scouting activities shall be permissible only between July 10 8 and July 31 and *between November 8 and November 28. as follows:*

"(i) Between November 20 and December 10 in the states of Michigan, West Virginia, Montana

A-88 _____ 1989 Convention Proceedings

and South Dakota, and

"(ii) Between November 2 and November 22 in the state of Virginia.

"(2) In those states that play the high school basketball season in the spring, such scouting activities shall be permissible only between July 10 8 and July 31 and between April 8 and April 28."

[Subparagraph (3) unchanged.]

Source: NCAA Council (Recruiting Committee).

Intent: In Division I women's basketball, to establish April 16 as the end of the spring contact period; to reduce by seven days the evaluation calendar; to begin the December evaluation period one week earlier; to provide evaluation opportunities during official tryouts for the ABAUSA Olympic Festival, and to adjust evaluation dates for those states that play the high school basketball season in the fall or spring without increasing the total number of evaluation opportunities.

Effective Date: August 1, 1989.

Action: Approved by Division I.

NO. 90 CONTACT PERIOD-DIVISION II FOOTBALL

Bylaws: Amend Article 1, Section 2-(a)-(5), page 60, as follows:

[Division II football only]

"(5) **In Division II**, such contacts shall be permissible in the sport of football only during the period between December 1 and **30 days subsequent to** the Saturday following the initial day for the signing of the National Letter of Intent in the sport of football, except as prohibited by Bylaw 1-2-(a)-(8). The Council shall have the authority to waive this provision by a two-thirds majority of its members present and voting for institutions with established admissions procedures utilizing acceptance dates subsequent to the normal contact deadline."

Source: University of California, Davis; California State University, Chico; California State University, Hayward; Humboldt State University; San Francisco State University, and Sonoma State University.

Intent: To extend the current Division II football contact period by 30 days subsequent to the Saturday following the initial signing day for the National Letter of Intent.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: Approved by Division II.

NO. 90-1 CONTACT PERIOD-DIVISION II FOOTBALL

Amend Proposal No. 90, Bylaw 1-2-(a)-5, page 77, as follows:

[Division II football only]

"(5) In Division II, such contacts shall be permissible in the

Legislative Proposals _____ A-89

sport of football only during the period between December 1 and 30 days subsequent to the Saturday following the initial day for the signing of the National Letter of Intent in the sport of football **the last day of February**, except as prohibited by Bylaw 1-2-(a)-(8). The Council shall have the authority to waive this provision by a two-thirds majority of its members present and voting for institutions with established admissions procedures utilizing acceptance dates subsequent to the normal contact deadline."

Source: Bloomsburg University of Pennsylvania, Clarion University of Pennsylvania, East Stroudsburg University of Pennsylvania, Indiana University of Pennsylvania, Kutztown University of Pennsylvania, Millersville University of Pennsylvania and Shippensburg University of Pennsylvania.

Action: Defeated by Division II. First approved but then defeated after motion to reconsider approved.

NO. 91 CONTACT PERIOD-DIVISION II FOOTBALL

Bylaws: Amend Article 1, Section 2-(a)-(5), page 60, as follows:
[Division II football only]

"(5) In Division II, such contacts shall be permissible in the sport of football only during the period between December 18 and the second Saturday following the initial day for the signing of the National Letter of Intent in the sport of football, except as prohibited by Bylaw 1-2-(a)-(8). The Council shall have the authority to waive this provision by a two-thirds majority of its members present and voting for institutions with established admissions procedures utilizing acceptance dates subsequent to the normal contact deadline."

Source: NCAA Council (Recruiting Committee).

Intent: To move the Division II football contact period one week later in the calendar year, without extending the period.

Effective Date: August 1, 1989.

Action: Moot due to approval of No. 90.

NO. 92 CONTACT PERIOD-DIVISION II BASKETBALL

Bylaws: Amend Article 1, Section 2-(a)-(7), page 60, as follows:
[Division II only]

"(7) Such contacts shall be permissible in the sport of basketball in Division II only during the period between September 7 and October 14 and the period between March 1 and 30 days subsequent to the Saturday following the initial day for the spring signing of the National Letter of Intent in the sport of basketball, except as prohibited by Bylaw 1-2-(a)-(8)-(i). The Council shall have the authority to waive this provision by a two-thirds majority of its members present and voting for institutions with established admissions procedures that utilize acceptance dates subsequent to the normal contact deadline."

Source: University of California, Davis; California State University, Chico; California State University, Hayward; Humboldt State University; San Francisco State University, and Sonoma State University.

Intent: To extend the current Division II basketball contact period by 30 days subsequent to the Saturday following the initial spring signing day for the National Letter of Intent.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: Approved by Division II.

NO. 93 CONTACT PERIOD-DIVISION II BASKETBALL

Bylaws: Amend Article 1, Section 2-(a)-(7), page 60, as follows:
[Division II only]

"(7) Such contacts shall be permissible in the sport of basketball in Division II only during the period between September 7 and October 14 and the period between March 18 and the second Saturday following the initial day for the spring signing of the National Letter of Intent in the sport of basketball, except as prohibited by Bylaw 1-2-(a)-(8)-(i). The Council shall have the authority to waive this provision by a two-thirds majority of its members present and voting for institutions with established admissions procedures that utilize acceptance dates subsequent to the normal contact deadline."

Source: NCAA Council (Recruiting Committee).

Intent: To move the Division II basketball spring contact period one week later in the calendar year, without extending the period.

Effective Date: August 1, 1989.

Action: Moot due to approval of No. 92.

NO. 94 RECRUITING CONTACTS-NATIONAL LETTER OF INTENT NONSUBSCRIBER

Bylaws: Amend Article 1, Section 2-(a)-(8), pages 60-61, as follows:
[Divided bylaw, Divisions I and II, divided vote]

"(8) In all sports, there shall be no on- or off-campus, in-person contacts by any institutional staff member or representative of an institution's athletics interests during the period 48 hours prior to 8 a.m. on the National Letter of Intent signing dates in the applicable sport. **This provision shall not apply to an institution that is not a subscriber to the National Letter of Intent program and whose established admissions procedures provide for a period of noncontact of at least 48 hours in connection with the notification of applicants of their admission.** In addition, there shall be no such contacts during the following time periods in the specified sports:"

[Subparagraphs (i) through (vii) unchanged.]

Source: All eight members of the Ivy Group.

Intent: To exempt from the current "quiet periods" in recruiting those member institutions that are not subscribers to the National Letter of Intent program and that have established their own institutional "quiet periods."

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: Defeated by Divisions I and II.

NO. 95 EVALUATION PERIODS-DIVISION II FOOTBALL

Bylaws: Amend Article 1, Section 3-(e), page 64, as follows:

[Division II football only]

"(e) In Division II, such scouting activities shall be permissible in the sport of football during the months of May and November, during the prospect's high school or junior college football season and during any high school all-star game that occurs in the state in which the member institution is located."

Source: All 10 members of the North Central Intercollegiate Athletic Conference.

Intent: To permit additional Division II football evaluation opportunities throughout the prospect's football season and during any high school all-star game that occurs in the state in which the member institution is located.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: Approved by Division II.

NO. 96 EVALUATION PERIODS-DIVISION II FOOTBALL

Bylaws: Amend Article 1, Section 3-(e), page 64, as follows:

[Division II football only]

"(e) In Division II, such scouting activities shall be permissible in the sport of football during the months of May and November and during the prospect's high school or junior college football season."

Source: Central Missouri State University; Lincoln University (Missouri); University of Missouri, Rolla; Northeast Missouri State University; Northwest Missouri State University; Southeast Missouri State University, and Southwest Baptist University.

Intent: To permit additional Division II football evaluation opportunities throughout the prospect's football season.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: Moot due to approval of No. 95.

NO. 97 EVALUATION PERIODS-DIVISION II FOOTBALL

Bylaws: Amend Article 1, Section 3-(e), page 64, as follows:

A-92 _____ 1989 Convention Proceedings

[Division II football only]

"(e) In Division II, such scouting activities shall be permissible in the sport of football during the months of May, October and November."

Source: All eight members of the Lone Star Conference and three other member institutions.

Intent: To permit additional Division II football evaluation opportunities during the month of October.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: Moot due to approval of No. 95.

NO. 98 FOOTBALL EVALUATION PERIODS

Bylaws: Amend Article 1, Section 3-(e), page 64, as follows:

[Divided bylaw, Divisions I-A, I-AA and II football only, divided vote]

"(e) Such scouting activities shall be permissible in the sport of football during the months of May and November and on Fridays during the month of October."

Source: Brigham Young University; Clemson University; University of Colorado; Colorado State University; University of Tennessee, Knoxville; University of Texas, El Paso, and two other member institutions.

Intent: In Divisions I-A, I-AA and II football, to permit additional football evaluation opportunities on Fridays during the month of October.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: Defeated by Divisions I-A and I-AA; moot for Division II due to approval of No. 95. Division I-A first approved, 61-52; later defeated after motion to reconsider approved. Division I-AA first defeated, 38-50; later approved after motion to reconsider approved. Convention then rescinded Division I-AA's vote to approve.

NO. 99 PRINTED RECRUITING AIDS-DIVISION I

Bylaws: Amend Article 1, Section 1-(b)-(3), pages 56-57, as follows:

[Division I only]

"(3) Institutions in Division I and Division II are permitted to provide only the following printed materials to prospective student-athletes:

"(i) Official academic, admissions and student-services publications published by the institution and available to all students;

"(ii) One annual athletics press guide (with only one color of printing inside the covers) per sport; or

"(iii) One annual athletics recruiting brochure (with only one color of printing inside the covers) per sport;

"(iii) One student-athlete handbook (with only one color of printing throughout the publication) to

Legislative Proposals _____ A-93

describe the institution's athletics department policies governing the conduct of student-athletes;

"(iv) Game programs;"

[Subparagraphs (v) through (xi), renumbered as (iv) through (x), unchanged.]

Source: NCAA Council (Division I Steering Committee).

Intent: To specify that a Division I member institution may provide either an annual athletics press guide or an annual athletics recruiting brochure to a prospective student-athlete, to eliminate game programs as a permissible printed recruiting aid and to establish a student-athlete handbook as a permissible printed recruiting aid.

Effective Date: August 1, 1989.

Action: Approved by Division I.

NO. 100 PRINTED RECRUITING AIDS-DIVISION II

Bylaws: Amend Article 1, Section 1-(b)-(3), pages 56-57, as follows:
[Division II only]

"(3) Institutions in Division I and Division II are permitted to provide only the following printed materials to prospective student-athletes:

[Subparagraphs (i) through (iii) unchanged.]

"(iv) **One student-athlete handbook (with only one color of printing throughout the publication) to describe the institution's athletics department policies governing the conduct of student-athletes;**"

[Subparagraphs (iv) through (xi), renumbered as (v) through (xii), unchanged.]

Source: NCAA Council (Division II Steering Committee).

Intent: To specify that a Division II member institution may provide a student-athlete handbook as a permissible printed recruiting aid.

Effective Date: August 1, 1989.

Action: Approved by Division II.

NO. 101 OFFICIAL VISITS-DIVISION I BASKETBALL

Bylaws: Amend Article 1, Section 9-(b), page 71, as follows:
[Division I only]

"(b) Division I-There shall be a limit on the total number of paid visits an institution may provide prospective student-athletes in the following sports during an academic year: Football-85; Basketball-15 18. The institution must maintain a written record of the paid visits of prospective student-athletes pursuant to this paragraph. The Council, by a two-thirds majority of its members present and voting, may approve exceptions to this regulation for institutions that have suffered extraordinary

personnel losses from one or more of their intercollegiate athletics teams due to accident or illness of a disastrous nature."

Source: NCAA Council (Recruiting Committee).

Intent: To increase from 15 to 18 the total number of paid visits that a Division I institution may provide prospective student-athletes annually in basketball, restoring the three visits eliminated in 1987.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: Approved by Division I, 189-120.

NO. 102 SELF-FINANCED VISITS-INSTITUTIONAL FACILITIES

Bylaws: Amend Article 1, Section 9-(f)-(1), pages 72-73, as follows:

[Divided bylaw, all divisions, divided vote]

"(1) During each such visit, the institution may not pay any expense or provide any entertainment except a maximum of three complimentary admissions (in Division I, issued only through a pass list) to a campus athletics event in which the institution's intercollegiate team competes, for the exclusive use of the prospective student-athlete and those persons accompanying the prospect on the visit, and transportation, when accompanied by an institutional staff member, only to view off-campus practice and competition sites **and other institutional facilities located within a 30-mile radius of the institution's campus.**"

Source: NCAA Council (Recruiting Committee).

Intent: To confirm that a member institution is permitted to transport a prospective student-athlete (during a self-financed visit) to view off-campus practice and competition sites and other institutional facilities located within a 30-mile radius of the institution's campus.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: Approved by all divisions.

NO. 103 OFFICIAL VISIT-TRANSPORTATION

Bylaws: Amend Article 1, Section 9-(g), page 73, as follows:

[Divided bylaw, Divisions I-A, I-AA, II and III football only, divided vote]

"(g) An institution or its representatives shall not furnish a prospective student-athlete, directly or indirectly, with transportation to the campus for enrollment, except that any member of an institution's athletics department staff may provide transportation for the prospective student-athlete to the campus from the bus or train station or major airport nearest the campus **(or, for football only, from any permissible site)** only on the occasion of the prospect's expense-paid visit or the student-athlete's initial arrival at the institution to attend classes."

Source: All eight members of the Southland Conference.

Intent: To permit any athletics department staff member to transport a prospective student-athlete from any permissible site to the campus or the nearest transportation center on the occasion of the prospect's expense-paid visit in the sport of football.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: Defeated by all divisions.

Championships and Extra Events

NO. 104 ADMINISTRATION OF CHAMPIONSHIPS

Executive Regulations: Amend Regulation 1, Section 1-(a), by adding new subparagraph (3), page 190, as follows:

[All divisions, common vote]

"(3) If an NCAA championship is discontinued for failure to meet the minimum sponsorship requirements set forth in subparagraphs (1) and (2) above, it shall be required to meet the minimum sponsorship requirements of Executive Regulations 1-1-(b)-(1) and (2) to be reestablished."

Source: NCAA Executive Committee.

Intent: To specify that an NCAA championship that falls below the minimum sponsorship requirements specified in Executive Regulations 1-1-(a)-(1) and (2) [for sports in which the Association had established championships prior to the 1982-83 academic year] and that subsequently seeks reestablishment must meet the sponsorship requirements specified in Executive Regulations 1-1-(b)-(1) and (2) [for sports in which championships were not established prior to the 1982-83 academic year].

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: Withdrawn.

NO. 105 INDIVIDUAL-TEAM CHAMPIONSHIPS

Executive Regulations: Amend Regulation 1, Section 3-(d), pages 196-197, as follows:

[All divisions, common vote]

"(d) In individual-team championships, member institutions from Division II and Division III may enter student-athletes in Division I meets and tournaments, provided the institution is in good standing and the individuals meet the prevailing eligibility requirements, including those in Bylaw 10-6-(f), and the following individual criteria of successful performance in the particular Division II or Division III championships: [Note Effective August 1, 1987, Executive Regulation 1-3-(d) was eliminated for those student-athletes first entering a Division II or Division III institution after that date.]"

A-96 _____ 1989 Convention Proceedings

[Subparagraphs (1) through (7) unchanged.]

Source: All 10 members of the North Central Intercollegiate Athletic Conference.

Intent: To reinstate Executive Regulation 1-3-(d) as it applied prior to August 1, 1987, permitting advancement by Divisions II and III student-athletes to Division I NCAA championships.

Effective Date: August 1, 1989.

Action: Defeated.

NO. 106 DIVISION III FOOTBALL CHAMPIONSHIP

Bylaws: Amend Article 10, Section 3-(b)-(2), page 151, as follows:

[Common bylaw, all divisions, divided vote]

"(2) A member of Division II that is classified in Division III in football shall not be eligible for the National Collegiate Division III Football Championship until it has been so classified for a period of two years unless its football program was classified in Division III prior to September 1, 1988."

Source: NCAA Council (Division III Steering Committee).

Intent: To specify that a Division II member institution that is classified in Division III in football shall not be eligible for the Division III Football Championship unless its football program was classified in Division III prior to September 1, 1988.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: Approved by all divisions as amended by No. 106-1. Motion to refer to Special Committee to Review the NCAA Membership Structure defeated by Division I, vote in other divisions not announced; approval of each division required.

NO. 106-1 DIVISION III FOOTBALL CHAMPIONSHIP

Amend Proposal No. 106, Bylaw 10-3-(b)-(2), page 84, as follows:

[Common bylaw, all divisions, divided vote]

"(2) A member of Division II that is classified in Division III in football shall not be eligible for the National Collegiate Division III Football Championship unless its football program was classified in Division III prior to no later than September 1, 1988 1989."

Source: Gannon University.

Action: Approved by all divisions.

NO. 107 TEAM CHAMPIONSHIPS

Executive Regulations: Amend Regulation 1, Section 3-(i), pages 198-199, as follows:

[All divisions, common vote]

"(i) In Divisions I and II, if a member conference, which conducts its regular-season competition under eligibility rules at least as stringent as those provisions of Bylaw 5 applicable to its members, conducts a championship in a team sport (and has

Legislative Proposals _____ A-97

conducted a championship in that sport for at least two consecutive years) and at least two-thirds of the conference's member institutions sponsor the sport as a varsity intercollegiate sport and participate in the process that determines the conference champion, the governing sports committee shall select the official conference representative (as determined by the conference through regular-season competition or a conference tournament) to participate in a national championship before it may select any other team from that conference."

[Subparagraphs (1) through (3) unchanged.]

Source: All 11 members of the State University of New York Athletic Conference and 16 other member institutions.

Intent: To eliminate the provisions of Executive Regulation 1-3-(i) [regarding the selection of official conference representatives for Division III member institutions] for Division III member institutions.

Effective Date: August 1, 1989.

Action: Approved.

NO. 108 POSTSEASON FOOTBALL CONTESTS- DIVISION III

Bylaws: Amend Article 2, Section 2, by deleting paragraphs (k) and (l), pages 78-79, as follows:

[Division III football only]

"(k) During the period of August 1 to the conclusion of its football game on the Saturday following the third Tuesday in November or 6 p.m. local time, whichever is earlier, a representative of a member institution, including its administrators, faculty, athletics staff members, conference officials, representatives of its athletics interests or student-athletes.

"(1) Shall not consider any formal or informal invitations, directly or indirectly, from any official or unofficial representative or agent of a certified postseason football game.

"(2) A member institution that violates the provisions of this bylaw shall be prohibited from participating in any postseason football game for a minimum of two years.

"(3) A member institution that has its team's participation in such a game determined by its conference rather than by the sponsoring agency of the game shall be exempt from the provisions of this bylaw.

"(l) During the period of August 1 to the conclusion of a member institution's football game on the Saturday following the third Tuesday in November or 6 p.m. local time, whichever is earlier, any official or unofficial representative or agent of a certified postseason football game:

"(1) Shall not extend an invitation, directly or indirectly, to a representative of a member institution, including its administrators, faculty, athletics staff members, conference officials, representatives of its athletics interests or student-athletes, to participate in its game.

"(2) The management of the certified game that violates the provisions of this bylaw shall return to the Association an amount not to exceed 50 percent of its share of gross receipts from the contest, which were determined in accor-

dance with Bylaw 2-2-(h) and Executive Regulation 4, with the amount to be determined by the Postseason Football Subcommittee of the Special Events Committee and approved by the NCAA Council.

"(3) The provisions of this bylaw shall not apply to contact by a representative or agent of a certified postseason football game with a member institution that has its team's participation in such a game determined by its conference rather than by the sponsoring agency of the game."

Source: NCAA Council (Division III Steering Committee).

Intent: To remove Division III member institutions from the legislation governing invitations to participate in certified postseason football games.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: Approved by Division III.

Eligibility

NO. 109 STUDENT-ATHLETE STATEMENT- AUTOMOBILE AND LOAN INFORMATION

Constitution: Amend Article 3, Section 9-(g), page 28, as follows:

[All divisions, common vote]

"(g) The student-athlete annually, prior to participation in intercollegiate competition during the academic year in question, shall sign a statement in a form prescribed by the NCAA Council in which the student-athlete submits information related to eligibility, recruitment, financial aid, amateur status and involvement in organized gambling activities concerning intercollegiate athletics competition under the governing legislation of this Association, **provides automobile registration and loan information**, and consents to be tested for the use of drugs prohibited by NCAA legislation. Failure to complete and sign the statement annually shall result in the student-athlete's ineligibility for participation in all intercollegiate competition."

Source: All nine members of the Southwest Athletic Conference.

Intent: To require the submission of automobile and loan information as a part of the student-athlete statement.

Effective Date: August 1, 1989.

Action: Defeated.

NO. 110 HIGH SCHOOL ALL-STAR GAMES

Constitution: Amend Article 3, Section 9-(a), page 26, relettering subsequent paragraphs, as follows:

[All divisions, common vote]

"(a) The student-athlete shall be denied the first year of intercollegiate athletics competition if, following completion of high school eligibility in the student-athlete's sport and prior to the student-athlete's high school graduation, the student-athlete participates in more than two all-star football contests or two all-star basketball contests."

Legislative Proposals _____ A-99

Source: NCAA Council (Special Committee on Deregulation and Rules Simplification, Special Events Committee).

Intent: To eliminate the restrictions on participation of prospective student-athletes in high school all-star competition.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: Defeated.

NO. 111 MAJOR JUNIOR A ICE HOCKEY

Constitution: Amend Case No. 37, page 323, relating to Constitution 3-1-(d), as follows:

[All divisions, common vote]

"Situation: An individual participates in ice hockey as a member of a team classified by the Canadian Amateur Hockey Association as a major junior A team.

"Question: Is the individual's eligibility for intercollegiate ice hockey competition at an NCAA member institution jeopardized by participating on such a team?

"Answer: Yes. Ice hockey teams in the United States and Canada classified by the Canadian Amateur Hockey Association as major junior A teams are professional teams as defined in O.I. 3 inasmuch as numerous professional ice hockey players have been assigned to major junior A teams under the terms of their professional contracts, and certain major junior A teams are receiving direct financial support from professional ice hockey teams. Participation by any individual on a major junior A hockey team subsequent to June 26, 1980, shall be considered prima facie evidence that the individual has participated on a team known, or which reasonably should have been known, to him or her to be a professional team under NCAA legislation and shall render the participant ineligible for intercollegiate athletics in ice hockey, subject to restoration of eligibility pursuant to the provisions of Constitution 4-2-(a)-O.I. 11. **An individual who has been involved in such participation shall be denied at least the first year of intercollegiate athletics competition in the sport of ice hockey at the certifying institution and shall be charged with the loss of at least one season of eligibility in the sport of ice hockey.**"

Source: Brown University, Clarkson University, Colgate University, Dartmouth University, Harvard University, Princeton University and 22 other member institutions.

Intent: To establish the denial of at least the first year of intercollegiate ice hockey competition and the loss of at least one season of eligibility in that sport as the minimum standards for the restoration of eligibility of individuals who have rendered themselves ineligible in the sport of ice hockey by virtue of their participation on teams in the United States and Canada classified by the Canadian Amateur Hockey Association as major junior A teams.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: Approved.

NO. 112 INCIDENTAL EXPENSES-OLYMPIC FESTIVAL VOLLEYBALL TRYOUTS

Constitution: Amend Article 3, Section 1-(h)-(8), page 16, as follows:

[All divisions, common vote]

"(8) Actual and necessary expenses for participation in USOC Olympic Festival basketball and volleyball tryouts."

Source: Colorado State University; University of Illinois, Champaign; Southern Illinois University, Carbondale; University of Texas, Arlington; University of Texas, Austin; University of Utah, and two other member institutions.

Intent: To permit member institutions to pay the actual and necessary expenses of enrolled student-athletes to attend official tryouts for the USOC Olympic Festival in the sport of volleyball.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: Approved. First approved motion to refer to Special Committee to Review Amateurism Issues; later motion to reconsider approved.

NO. 113 SUMMER BASKETBALL

A. Constitution: Amend Article 3, Section 9-(b), by deleting subparagraph (1), pages 26-27, as follows:

[All divisions, common vote]

"(1) A student-athlete may compete during the period between June 15 and August 31 on a team in a league approved by the NCAA Council, if the student-athlete has received written permission from the institution's director of athletics (or the director's official representative) for such participation. For such a league to be approved, it shall meet the following requirements:

"(i) No member team shall include on its roster more than one player with intercollegiate eligibility remaining in the sport of basketball from any one college, university or junior college.

"(ii) Neither the league nor any member team shall have on its staff or as a participant any person associated in any employment capacity with a college, university or junior college.

"(iii) No member team shall make any payments for play or expenses directly or indirectly to any player.

"(iv) All players must limit their competition to one team in one league.

"(v) No admission shall be charged for any game, no fee shall be charged for parking to attend any game, no revenue shall be realized at any game from raffles or similar activities and no revenue shall be realized from over-the-air or cable television or radio rights fees for any game.

"(vi) No all-star games of any kind shall be permitted

"(vii) Postseason play-offs or tournaments shall be permitted, provided such play-offs or tournaments involve intraleague competition and are completed

ed by August 31

"(viii) League play shall be within 100 miles of the student-athlete's official residence or within 100 miles of the institution the student-athlete attends."

B. Bylaws: Amend Article 4, Section 1, by adding new paragraph (h), page 100, as follows:

[Divided bylaw, all divisions, divided vote]

"(h) A student-athlete may compete during the period between June 15 and August 31 on a basketball team in a league approved by the NCAA Council, if the student-athlete has received written permission from the institution's director of athletics (or the director's official representative) for such participation. For such a league to be approved, it shall meet the following requirements:

"(1) No member team shall include on its roster more than one player with intercollegiate eligibility remaining in the sport of basketball from any one college, university or junior college.

"(2) Neither the league nor any member team shall have on its staff or as a participant any person associated in any employment capacity with a college, university or junior college.

"(3) No member team shall make any payments for play or expenses directly or indirectly to any player.

"(4) All players must limit their competition to one team in one league.

"(5) No admission shall be charged for any game, no fee shall be charged for parking to attend any game, no revenue shall be realized at any game from raffles or similar activities and no revenue shall be realized from over-the-air or cable television or radio rights fees for any game.

"(6) No all-star games of any kind shall be permitted.

"(7) Postseason play-offs or tournaments shall be permitted, provided such play-offs or tournaments involve intraleague competition and are completed by August 31.

"(8) League play shall be within 100 miles of the student-athlete's official residence or within 100 miles of the institution the student-athlete attends."

Source: State University of New York, Binghamton; Brockport State University College; Buffalo State College; Cortland State University College; New Paltz State University College, and Oneonta State University College.

Intent: To permit the application of the Association's summer basketball legislation on a division-by-division basis by moving the legislation from the constitution to the bylaws.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: Part A approved. Part B approved by Divisions I and II, defeated by Division III. Part B first approved by Division III; later defeated after motion to reconsider approved. Motion to rescind Division III vote ruled out of order. Motion to reconsider Division II approval defeated.

NO. 114 DRUG TESTING-ALL-STAR ELIGIBILITY

Bylaws: Amend Article 5, Section 2-(a) and (b), page 118, as follows:

[Divided bylaw, all divisions, divided vote]

"(a) A student-athlete who is found to have utilized (in preparation for or participation in an NCAA championship or certified postseason football contest) a substance on the list of banned drugs set forth in Executive Regulation 1-7-(b) shall not be eligible for further participation in postseason competition, **including NCAA-certified college all-star football or basketball contests.** Subject to the ineligibility provisions of the following paragraph, the certifying institution may appeal to the Eligibility Committee for restoration of the student-athlete's eligibility if the institution concludes that circumstances warrant restoration.

"(b) A student-athlete who tests positive in accordance with the testing methods authorized by the Executive Committee shall remain ineligible for postseason competition, **including NCAA-certified college all-star football or basketball contests,** for a minimum of 90 days after the test date. If the student-athlete tests positive after being restored to eligibility, he or she shall be charged with the loss of one season of postseason eligibility in all sports and shall remain ineligible for postseason competition at least through the succeeding academic year."

Source: NCAA Council (Executive Committee).

Intent: To extend the postseason ineligibility of a student-athlete who is found to have utilized a substance on the list of banned drugs to include NCAA-certified college all-star football and basketball contests.

Effective Date: August 1, 1989.

Action: Withdrawn.

NO. 115 TRANSFER ELIGIBILITY-DIVISION III

A. Bylaws: Amend Article 5, Section 1-(j)-(7), pages 110-111, as follows:

[Division III only]

"(7) A transfer student from a four-year institution shall not be eligible for any NCAA championship until the student has fulfilled a residence requirement of one full academic year (two full semesters or three full quarters), and one full calendar year has elapsed from the first regular registration and attendance date at the certifying Division I or Division II institution.

Further, a transfer student-athlete admitted after the 12th class day may not utilize that semester or quarter for the purpose of establishing residency under either the academic-year or calendar-year requirement. At a Division III institution, eligibility is not permitted *for one calendar year from the student's official withdrawal date from the previous institution immediately.*"

[Subparagraphs (i) and (ii) unchanged.]

B. Bylaws: Amend Article 5, Section 1-(j)-(10), page 112, as follows:

[Division III only]

"(10) A transfer student from a junior college is not eligible in a Divisions II and III institutions for any NCAA championships the first academic year in residence unless the student has."

[Subparagraphs (i) and (ii) unchanged.]

C. Bylaws: Amend Article 5, Section 1-(j), by adding new subparagraph (11), page 112, renumbering subsequent subparagraph, as follows:

[Division III only]

"(11) A transfer student from a junior college shall be eligible immediately for any NCAA championship and for regular-season practice and competition."

D. Bylaws: Amend Article 5, Section 1-(j)-(11), pages 112-113, as follows:

[Division III only]

"(11) A transfer student from a four-year institution or a transfer student from a junior college shall be eligible to compete only at the subvarsity level at the certifying Division II or Division III institution prior to meeting the transfer eligibility requirements set forth in subparagraphs (7) and (10). Such subvarsity competition shall count as a season of competition in the sport involved."

E. Bylaws: Amend Article 5, Section 1-(k), pages 113-114, as follows:

[Division III only]

"(k) The student-athlete's eligibility for NCAA championships is affected by, and the student-athlete must conform to, the following additional transfer provisions:

"(1) A student who transfers from a junior college after transferring from any four-year college shall complete one calendar year of residence at the certifying institution, unless the student:

"(i) Has completed a minimum of 24 semester hours or a minimum of 36 quarter hours at the junior college following transfer from the four-year college, and one calendar year has elapsed since the transfer from the first four-year college, and, for Division I and Division II member institutions, has graduated from the junior college; or

"(ii) Returns to the four-year college from which the student transferred to the junior college, provided the

student did not have an unfulfilled residence requirement at the time of the transfer from the four-year college, or

"(iii) Transfers to a Division III member institution.

"(2) If a student-athlete transfers from a four-year institution to a junior college and prior to graduation from junior college enrolls at another four-year a **Division I or Division II member** institution, the student-athlete shall be subject to the one-year residence requirement, even though during the course of that one-year residence the student-athlete may earn sufficient credits to obtain a degree at the junior college; further, if a junior college student transfers to and attends a *four-year Division I or Division II member* institution, the student is subject to the one-year residence requirement of this provision at that institution, even though the student transfers back to the junior college and obtains a degree.

"(3) A student who transfers from to a **Division I or Division II collegiate member** institution while the student is disqualified or suspended for disciplinary reasons must complete one calendar year of residence at the certifying institution.

[Subparagraphs (4) and (5) unchanged.]

"(6) **In Division I and Division II**, Aa transfer student, upon completion of two full semesters or three full quarters of academic work and after a full calendar year has elapsed, shall be eligible for any NCAA championship that is in progress at the time the student completes the respective periods.

[Subparagraphs (7) and (8) unchanged.]

"(9) **In Division I and Division II**, the eligibility of a transfer student from a branch school that conducts an intercollegiate athletics program shall be determined by the applicable junior college transfer provisions of Bylaws 5-1-(j)-(8), (9) and (10).

"(10) **In Division I and Division II**, Aa transfer student from a junior college is not eligible for NCAA championship competition in a sport if the student-athlete has competed at the junior college in that sport during the same academic year."

F. Bylaws: Amend Article 5, Section 1-(m)-(12), page 116, as follows:

[Division III only]

"(12) If a student transfers to a Division III member institution from any four-year institution, provided the student receives a written release from the director of athletics at the institution from which the student transferred."

Source: NCAA Council (Division III Steering Committee).

Intent: To permit a student-athlete who transfers from a two-year or four-year collegiate institution to a Division III member institution to be immediately eligible for regular-season and championships competition upon transfer.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: Approved by Division III.

NO. 116 TRANSFER RULE-ONE-TIME EXCEPTION

Bylaws: Amend Article 5, Section 1-(m)-(13)-(ii), page 117, as follows:

[Divided bylaw, all divisions, divided vote]

"(ii) The student did not receive athletically related financial assistance at the previous institution, or the previous institution verifies in writing that the student's athletically related financial assistance was not renewed for the ensuing academic year for reasons that were unrelated to the student's transfer or that were beyond the control of the student;"

Source: All seven members of the Metropolitan Collegiate Athletic Conference.

Intent: To delete the consideration of a student-athlete's financial aid status at the original institution from the one-time exception to the transfer residence requirement.

Effective Date: August 1, 1989.

Action: Defeated by Divisions I and II; moot for Division III due to approval of No. 115.

NO. 117 TRANSFER RULE-ONE-TIME EXCEPTION

Bylaws: Amend Article 5, Section 1-(m)-(13)-(ii), page 117, as follows:

[Divided bylaw, all divisions, divided vote]

"(ii) The student did not receive athletically related financial assistance at the previous institution, or the previous institution verifies in writing that the student's athletically related financial assistance either was not renewed for the ensuing academic year for reasons that were unrelated to the student's transfer or that were beyond the control of the student, or was renewed for the ensuing year but the institution has dropped the student from the team for which the student had been awarded that aid initially."

Source: All eight members of the Ivy Group.

Intent: To permit a student-athlete to receive the one-time exception to the transfer residence requirement when the original institution dropped the student from a team but would have permitted the student to retain his or her athletically related financial aid.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: Approved by Divisions I (157-121) and II (106-46); moot for Division III due to approval of No. 115.

NO. 118 JUNIOR COLLEGE TRANSFER STUDENT-DROPPED SPORT

Bylaws: Amend Article 5, Section 1-(k)-(1), by adding new subpara-

A-106 _____ 1989 Convention Proceedings

graph (iii), page 113, as follows:

[Divided bylaw, Divisions I and II, divided vote]

"(iii) Initially was enrolled in a four-year collegiate institution that never sponsored the student's sport on the intercollegiate level while the student was in attendance at the institution (provided the student had never attended any other four-year collegiate institution that offered intercollegiate competition in that particular sport) and provided the student was a qualifier and presented a minimum of 24 semester hours or 36 quarter hours of transferable degree credit with an accumulative minimum grade-point average of 2.000, satisfactorily completed an average of at least 12 semester or quarter hours of transferable degree credit acceptable toward any baccalaureate degree program at the certifying institution during each academic term of attendance and spent at least two semesters or three quarters in residence at the junior college (excluding summer sessions)."

Source: Butler University, Florida International University, George Mason University, Georgia Institute of Technology, Georgia Southern College, University of Toledo and four other member institutions.

Intent: To combine the provisions of Bylaws 5-1-(m)-(8) and 5-1-(j)-(8) to permit immediate eligibility for a student who transfers from a junior college after first attending a four-year collegiate institution that did not sponsor the student-athlete's sport.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: Approved by Divisions I and II.

NO. 119 JUNIOR COLLEGE TRANSFER WAIVER-LIMITED PRESEASON TRYOUTS

Bylaws: Amend Article 5, Section 1-(n)-(3), page 118, as follows:

[Divided bylaw, Divisions II and III, divided vote]

"(3) If the student transfers to the certifying institution and the following conditions are met:

"(i) The student was not recruited per O.I. 100 by the certifying institution;

"(ii) No athletically related financial assistance has been received by the student-athlete;

"(iii) The student-athlete has neither practiced nor competed in intercollegiate athletics prior to transfer, except that a student-athlete may have participated in limited preseason tryouts, and

"(iv) The student-athlete was eligible for admission to the certifying institution prior to initial enrollment in the junior college."

Source: NCAA Council (Special Committee on Deregulation and

Legislative Proposals _____ A-107

Rules Simplification).

Intent: To specify that a nonrecruited junior college transfer student may qualify for a waiver per Bylaw 5-1-(n)-(3) if the student was not recruited at the certifying institution and did not participate in practice other than in limited preseason tryouts.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: Approved by Division II; moot for Division III due to approval of No. 115.

NO. 120 SEASONS OF COMPETITION-DIVISION I HARDSHIP EXCEPTION

Bylaws: Amend Article 5, Section 1-(d)-(2)-(i), page 102, as follows:
[Division I only]

"(i) It occurs in one of the four seasons of intercollegiate competition at any four-year collegiate institution for members of Division I, or at any two-year or four-year collegiate institution for members of Division II or III."

Source: University of Alabama, Birmingham; University of Arkansas, Little Rock; Eastern Washington University; McNeese State University; University of New Orleans; Northeast Louisiana University, and five other member institutions.

Intent: To permit a student-athlete who has been injured or ill at a two-year collegiate institution to receive a hardship waiver for purposes of seasons of competition in Division I, as is currently the case in Divisions II and III.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: Defeated by Division I.

NO. 121 SEASONS OF COMPETITION-SKIING

Bylaws: Amend Article 5, Section 1-(d)-(3), page 102, as follows:
[Division I only]

"(3) Any participation by a student as an individual or as a representative of any team in organized competition in a sport during each 12-month period after the student's 20th birthday and prior to matriculation at a member institution shall count as one year of varsity competition in that sport, provided, however, that in no event shall the student be charged with more than one year of competition in that sport in any 12-month period after the student's 20th birthday. In the sports of men's ice hockey and men's and women's skiing, if a prospective student-athlete becomes 20 years old during a season of organized noncollegiate competition, the student-athlete may complete that season without being charged a season of competition. Participation in organized competition during time spent in the United States armed services shall be excepted."

Source: University of Colorado, University of New Mexico, New Mexico State University, University of Utah, University of

A-108 _____ 1989 Convention Proceedings

Vermont and University of Wyoming.

Intent: To permit a prospective student-athlete in the sport of men's and women's skiing who becomes 20 years old during a noncollegiate competitive season to complete that season without being charged a year of eligibility per Bylaw 5-1-(d)-(3), as is currently the case in ice hockey.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: Approved by Division I, 166-79.

Membership and Classification

NO. 122 "RESTRICTED MEMBERSHIP"- PROBATIONARY PERIOD

Bylaws: Amend Article 10, Section 1-(f), pages 148-149, as follows:
[Common bylaw, all divisions, divided vote]

"(f) If an institution or its sport (per Bylaw 10-3) does not qualify for membership in any division, the institution (or its sport) shall **may** be placed in a 'restricted membership' category for a minimum of one year.

[Subparagraph (1) unchanged.]

"(2) An institution that fails to meet either the minimum men's or women's sports sponsorship criterion for its division shall, **after a one-year probationary period**, be placed in 'restricted membership' status as follows:

"(i) In the first academic year after failure to meet the requirements, the institution shall be placed on probation for one year for its entire program (both men's and women's sports). If it has failed to meet the sports sponsorship criteria at the end of the probationary year, it shall be placed in the 'restricted membership' classification. An institution will be afforded the one-year probationary period for failure to comply with sports sponsorship criteria only once in every 10-year period. On any other occasion, an institution failing to comply with its respective division criteria shall be placed in 'restricted membership' classification and shall not be eligible for NCAA championship competition in all sports (both men's and women's)."

[Subparagraph (2)-(ii) and subparagraphs (3) through (6) unchanged.]

Source: Duquesne University; Fairleigh Dickinson University, Teaneck; Fordham University; Jacksonville University; St. Louis University, and the University of South Alabama.

Intent: To permit a one-year probationary period for institutions failing to meet the minimum sports sponsorship criteria for their respective divisions once in every 10-year period.

Legislative Proposals _____ A-109

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: Approved by all divisions.

**NO. 122-1 "RESTRICTED MEMBERSHIP"-
PROBATIONARY PERIOD**

Amend Proposal No. 122, Bylaw 10-1-(f), page 95, as follows:

[Common bylaw, all divisions, divided vote]

"(f) If an institution or its sport (per Bylaw 10-3) does not qualify for membership in any division, the institution (or its sport) *may* **shall** be placed in a 'restricted membership' category for a minimum of one year., **subject to the following subparagraphs:**

[Subparagraph (1) unchanged.]

"(2) An institution that fails to meet either the minimum men's or women's sports sponsorship criterion for its division shall, *after a one year probationary period*, be placed in 'restricted membership' status as follows:

"(i) In the first academic year after failure to meet the requirements, the institution *shall be placed on probation for one year for its entire program (both men's and women's sports). If it has failed to meet the sports sponsorship criteria at the end of the probationary year, it shall be placed in the 'restricted membership' classification. An institution will be afforded the one-year probationary period for failure to comply with sports sponsorship criteria only once in every 10-year period. On any other occasion, an institution failing to comply with its respective division criteria shall be placed in 'restricted membership' classification and shall not be eligible for NCAA championship competition in all sports (both men's and women's).*

"(ii) **When an institution fails to meet either the minimum men's or women's sports sponsorship criterion for its division, the Council may authorize exceptions to the mandatory 'restricted membership' category based on objective evidence that demonstrates circumstances which warrant an alternative action of placing the institution on probation for one year for its entire program (both men's and women's sports). If the institution has failed to meet the sports sponsorship criteria at the end of the probationary year, it shall be placed in the 'restricted membership' classification. An institution may be afforded the one-year probationary period for failure to comply with sports sponsorship criteria only once in every 10-year period. On any other occasion, an institution failing to comply with its respective division criteria shall be placed in 'restricted membership' classification and shall not be eligible for NCAA championship competition in all sports (both men's and women's).**"

[Former subparagraph (2)-(ii) relettered as (2)-(iii); and subparagraphs (3) through (6) unchanged.]

Source: NCAA Council.

Action: Defeated. Defeated by Divisions II and III, vote not announced in Division I; approval of each division required.

NO. 123 "RESTRICTED MEMBERSHIP" WAIVER

Bylaws: Amend Article 10, Section 1-(g)-(4), pages 149-150, as follows:

[Common bylaw, all divisions, divided vote]

"(4) If the division votes to admit the institution as a member of that division, such classification shall become effective in accordance with Bylaw 9-2-(a)-(2) for a new member of the Association, *or the September 1 following the Convention (or the beginning of practice in any sport for that fall term or the first day of classes for that fall term, whichever occurs first) for an institution seeking multidivision classification or change of division membership, or immediately for a member institution that receives a waiver of the 'restricted membership' classification.*"

[Subparagraphs (i) and (ii) unchanged.]

Source: NCAA Council.

Intent: To confirm that a member institution that receives a waiver of the "restricted membership" classification may receive an immediate change in membership status.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: Approved by all divisions.

NO. 124 SPORTS SPONSORSHIP CRITERIA

Bylaws: Amend Article 11, Section 4-(b)-(3), page 165, as follows:

[Divided bylaw, all divisions, divided vote]

"(3) In the team sports (i.e., baseball, basketball, field hockey, football, ice hockey, lacrosse, soccer, softball, volleyball and water polo), each game in a doubleheader, tripleheader or tournament shall be counted as one contest. In the individual sports as listed in (2) above, **not more than two** *each* institution-vs.-institution meetings shall be counted **as contests** in any multi-team competition (e.g., quadrangular track meet). If the institution achieves a single score in competition with the other competing institutions (e.g., a conference championship), it shall be counted as one contest."

Source: NCAA Council.

Intent: To specify that for purposes of meeting the sports sponsorship criteria in individual sports, not more than two institution-vs.-institution meetings in a multiteam competition shall be counted as contests.

Effective Date: August 1, 1989.

Action: Approved by Divisions II and III, defeated by Division I.

NO. 125 FINANCIAL AID-DIVISION III

Bylaws: Amend Article 11, Section 3-(a)-(4), by adding new subparagraph (iv), page 162, as follows:

[Division III only]

"(iv) Assistance awarded in accordance with Constitution 3-4-(a)-(3) and (4)."

Source: NCAA Council (Division III Steering Committee).

Intent: To specify that assistance awarded in accordance with Constitution 3-4-(a)-(3) and (4) may be offered to a student-athlete in Division III without consideration of the recipient's need.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: Approved by Division III.

Playing Seasons

[Note: Also see Proposal No. 147 in the Deregulation/Simplification grouping.]

NO. 126 NUMBER OF CONTESTS-DIVISION I-A

Bylaws: Amend Article 3, Section 3-(a)-(1), page 89, as follows:

[Division I-A football only]

"(1) Division I—Maximum number of contests:

"Football 11 12"

Source: University of Arkansas, Fayetteville; Auburn University; Georgia Institute of Technology; University of Southwestern Louisiana; University of Tennessee, Knoxville, and Texas A&M University.

Intent: To permit one additional football contest in Division I-A.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: Defeated by Division I-A. First approved, 67-41, as amended by No. 126-1. Later defeated after motion to reconsider approved.

NO. 126-1 NUMBER OF CONTESTS-DIVISION I-A

Amend Proposal No. 126, Bylaw 3-3-(a)-(1), page 97, as follows:

[Division I-A football only]

"(1) Division I—Maximum number of contests:

"Football 12 11 (and a 12th game, once every four years, played in a foreign country)"

Source: Rutgers University, New Brunswick.

Action: Defeated by Division I-A. First approved; later defeated

A-112 _____ 1989 Convention Proceedings

after motion to reconsider approved.

NO. 127 PLAYING SEASONS—SEGMENT BREAK

A. Bylaws: Amend Article 3, Section 1-(b), page 84, as follows:

[Divided bylaw, all divisions, divided vote]

"(b) An institution's playing season in a particular sport may be subdivided into no more than two distinct segments, each consisting shall consist of a number of consecutive full weeks (with the total not to exceed 26 weeks in Divisions I and II and 21 weeks in Division III) and, determined at the institution's discretion. If divided into two segments, that portion concluded by the NCAA championship in the sport shall be known as the 'traditional segment' and the other as the 'nontraditional segment.'"

[Subparagraphs (1) and (2) unchanged.]

B. Bylaws: Amend Article 3, Section 1-(f), page 84, as follows:

[Divided bylaw, all divisions, divided vote]

"(f) In traditional and nontraditional segments, any practice or competition during published vacation, holiday and final-examination periods during the academic year shall be counted as part of the 26-week or 21-week total. If practice or competition is not scheduled during any full week (seven consecutive days), of a vacation, final-examination period or holiday period it shall neither not be counted toward the 26-week or 21-week total, nor constitute a break in a segment."

Source: All 10 members of the New Jersey Athletic Conference.

Intent: To eliminate the requirement that playing-season segments consist of consecutive weeks and to permit member institutions to designate breaks (i.e., full weeks without practice or competition) within traditional and nontraditional segments.

Effective Date: August 1, 1989.

Action: Withdrawn.

NO. 128 PRACTICE ACTIVITIES—CAPTAIN'S PRACTICES

Bylaws: Amend O.I. 301, following Bylaw 3-1-(j), page 86, as follows:

[All divisions, common vote]

"O.I. 301. Engaging in any or all of the following activities (if they involve sports-related information and have an athletics purpose) on any day constitutes 'practice': field or floor practice, chalk talk, or lecture, or the discussion or showing of motion pictures, or the assembly of student-athletes for 'captain's practices,' even if no coaching staff members are present. The duration and distribution of these activities on any day are to be determined by the institution itself, subject to controlling legislation by the conference or similar organization of which the institution is a member, and institutional staff members shall take proper steps to discourage the assembly of student-athletes (for practice activities) in any area other

Legislative Proposals _____ A-113

than weight conditioning except during the permissible playing and practice season in their sport."

Source: All nine members of the Southwest Athletic Conference.

Intent: To include "captain's practices" within the definition of practice activities outside the permissible playing and practice season, and to require member institutions to take the proper steps to discourage the assembling of student-athletes (for practice activities) in any area other than weight conditioning except during the permissible playing and practice seasons.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: Withdrawn.

NO. 129 FOOTBALL COACHES RETIREMENT TRUST BENEFIT GAME

A. Bylaws: Amend Article 3, Section 2-(b)-(2)-(ii), page 87, as follows:

[Divided bylaw, Divisions I-A, I-AA, II and III football only, divided vote]

"(ii) The National Football Foundation benefit game sponsored by the National Association of Collegiate Directors of Athletics and or the American Football Coaches Retirement Trust benefit game, both to be played in the week prior to the beginning of the competitive football season as noted above, and"

B. Bylaws: Amend Article 3, Section 3-(b), page 91, as follows:

[Divided bylaw, Divisions I-A, I-AA, II and III football only, divided vote]

"(b) The maximum number of contests in football shall exclude the spring scrimmage; the National Football Foundation benefit game; the American Football Coaches Retirement Trust benefit game; a conference championship game between division champions of a member conference of 12 or more institutions that is divided into two divisions (of six or more institutions each), each of which conducts round-robin, regular-season competition among the members of that division, and the post-season game or games permitted in Bylaw 3-2-(b)-(2)."

Source: University of Colorado, Colorado State University, Oklahoma State University, University of Oregon, Washington State University and University of Wyoming.

Intent: To exclude the participation of a Division I-A, I-AA, II or III member institution in the American Football Coaches Retirement Trust benefit game from preseason and numerical contest limitations.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: Approved by all divisions (Division I-A, 61-47) as amended by No. 129-1.

A-114 _____ 1989 Convention Proceedings

NO. 129-1 FOOTBALL COACHES RETIREMENT TRUST BENEFIT GAME

Amend Proposal No. 129-A, Bylaw 3-2-(b)-(2)-(ii), page 98, as follows:

[Divided bylaw, Divisions I-A, I-AA, II and III football only, divided vote]

"(ii) The National Football Foundation benefit game sponsored by the National Association of Collegiate Directors of Athletics or the American Football Coaches Retirement Trust benefit game, both sponsored by the National Association of Collegiate Directors of Athletics, to be played in the week prior to the beginning of the competitive football season as noted above, and"

Effective Date: Immediately August 1, 1990."

Source: University of Colorado.

Action: Approved by all divisions.

NO. 130 PRESEASON PRACTICE—WOMEN'S VOLLEYBALL

A. Bylaws: Amend Article 3, Section 1-(g), pages 84-85, as follows:

[Divided bylaw, all divisions, divided vote]

"(g) Under no circumstances shall a Division I institution's traditional segment (in sports other than football and women's volleyball) commence prior to August 15 or the first day on which classes are scheduled in the institution's fall term, whichever occurs first. Under no circumstances shall a Division II or Division III institution's traditional segment (in sports other than football and women's volleyball) commence prior to August 15."

B. Bylaws: Amend Article 3, Section 1-(h), by adding new subparagraph (7), page 86, as follows:

[Divided bylaw, all divisions, divided vote]

"(7) Women's Volleyball—That date which will permit a maximum of 29 'practice opportunities' prior to its first scheduled intercollegiate match. In determining the number of 'practice opportunities,' Sundays will be excluded from the counting; but otherwise there shall be counted one for each day beginning with the opening of classes, one for each day classes are not in session in the week of the first scheduled intercollegiate match and two for each other day in the preseason practice period."

Source: California State University, Long Beach; Colorado State University; Illinois State University; University of Minnesota, Twin Cities; University of New Haven; New Mexico State University, and four other member institutions.

Intent: To permit a member institution's women's volleyball program to commence preseason practice activities on the day that will permit a maximum of 29 "practice opportunities" prior to its first scheduled intercollegiate match.

Legislative Proposals _____ A-115

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: Withdrawn.

NO. 131 PLAYING SEASON—DIVISION I BASEBALL

Bylaws: Amend Article 3, Section 1-(a)-(1), page 83, as follows:
[Division I only]

"(1) Division I—A maximum of six months (i.e., 26 weeks) during the academic year for water polo **and baseball**, and during the full year for all other team sports (except football and basketball) as defined in Executive Regulation 1-6-(b)-(3)-(i)."

Source: Central Michigan University; University of Maine, Orono; Mississippi State University; University of New Orleans; St. John's University (New York), and Southwest Missouri State University.

Intent: To limit the application of the 26-week playing-season limitation in Division I baseball to the academic year.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: Approved by Division I, 158-126.

NO. 132 CONTEST LIMITATIONS

Bylaws: Amend Article 3, Section 3-(j)-(1), page 93, as follows:
[Division I only]

"(1) Divisions I and III—Not more than one of the contests set forth in Bylaw 3-2-(g) *(in Division I, excluding the contest against a foreign team in the United States).*"

Source: All nine members of the Big East Conference.

Intent: To eliminate the current exemption for a basketball contest against a foreign team in the United States, instead making that contest one of the alternatives for the annual exemption of one contest per Bylaw 3-3-(j)-(1).

Effective Date: August 1, 1989.

Action: Withdrawn.

NO. 133 PRESEASON NATIONAL INVITATION TOURNAMENT

Bylaws: Amend Article 3, Section 2-(h), page 88, as follows:
[Division I only]

"(h) In the sport of basketball, Division I member institutions may participate in the Preseason National Invitation Tournament sponsored by the Metropolitan Intercollegiate Basketball Association. The tournament shall be a 16-team, single-elimination event (with one consolation game) conducted each year *during the last two weekends in November* **during the period from November 14 through November 30.** Participation in the tournament shall be limited, by institution, to once in any four-year period and, by conference, to one institution of a mem-

A-116 _____ 1989 Convention Proceedings

ber conference per tournament."

Source: All eight members of the Association of Mid-Continent Universities and 42 other member institutions.

Intent: To revise the period during which Division I member institutions may participate in the Preseason National Invitation Tournament.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: Approved by Division I.

NO. 134 PLAYING SEASON—DIVISION II BASEBALL

Bylaws: Amend Article 3, Section 1-(a)-(2), page 83, as follows:
[Division II only]

"(2) Division II—A maximum of six months (i.e., 26 weeks) **during the academic year for baseball and during the full year for each all other team sports** (other than football and basketball) as defined in Executive Regulation 1-6-(b)-(3)-(i)."

Source: University of California, Riverside; California Polytechnic State University, San Luis Obispo; California State University, Dominguez Hills; California State University, Los Angeles; California State University, Northridge, and Chapman College.

Intent: To limit the application of the 26-week playing-season limitation in Division II baseball to the academic year.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: Defeated by Division II. First defeated, 53-70; then defeated, 66-74, after motion to reconsider approved.

NO. 135 OUT-OF-SEASON PRACTICE LIMITATIONS

Bylaws: Amend Article 3, Section 4-(c), page 95, as follows:
[Division III only]

"(c) Outside the institution's declared playing season per Bylaw 3-1-(a) and except as noted otherwise in this section, student-athletes and members of the coaching staff in a particular sport shall not engage in organized practice activities. Outside the established playing season, individual consultation **and instruction involving a student-athlete and one member of an institution's coaching staff**, initiated voluntarily by a the student-athlete, is permissible, *provided the coach and student-athlete do not engage in practice activities.*"

Source: California Institute of Technology, Claremont McKenna-Harvey Mudd-Scripps Colleges, University of La Verne, Occidental College, University of Redlands and Whittier College.

Intent: To permit individual, voluntary instruction between a student-athlete and one member of a Division III institution's coaching staff outside the established playing season.

Effective Date: August 1, 1989.

Legislative Proposals _____ A-117

Action: Defeated by Division III.

NO. 136 FOREIGN TOURS

Bylaws: Amend Article 3, Section 6-(b)-(4), page 97, as follows:
[Division III only]

"(4) An institution does not engage in such a foreign tour more than once every ~~four~~ **three** years in each sport;"

Source: Delaware Valley College; Dickinson College; Elizabethtown College; Fairleigh Dickinson University, Madison; Haverford College, and 11 other members of the Middle Atlantic States Collegiate Athletic Conference.

Intent: To permit a Division III member institution to exempt an officially sanctioned foreign tour once every three (rather than four) years.

Effective Date: August 1, 1989.

Action: Approved by Division III.

NO. 137 INDIVIDUAL CONTEST LIMITATIONS- DIVISION III FOOTBALL AND BASKETBALL

Bylaws: Amend Case No. 251, page 387, relating to Bylaw 3-3-(a)-(5), as follows:

[Division III only]

"Situation: Freshmen may participate in regular-season varsity football and basketball contests at all NCAA member institutions.

"Question: If a student-athlete is a member of both the varsity and junior varsity or freshman teams of the institution, in how many contests against outside competition may the student-athlete participate during the same season?

"Answer: Eleven games in football and 28 in basketball (26 if in Division III). The total number of games in each of these sports in which a student-athlete may participate is governed by the limitation on the maximum number of regular intercollegiate contests in which an institution may engage. **In determining the participation of an individual player in a specific Division III football contest (11-contest limit), the contest shall not be counted toward the individual player's limit if the player participates only in the final 7½ minutes of the final quarter of a varsity contest and/or in kicking situations (as a member of the kickoff or kickoff-return team, as a member of the punt or punt-return team, or as a member of the field goal or point-after-touchdown team). In determining the participation of an individual player in a specific Division III basketball contest (26-contest limit), the contest shall not be counted toward the individual player's limit if the player participates only in the final five minutes of a varsity contest."**

Source: All nine members of the College Conference of Illinois and Wisconsin.

A-118 _____ 1989 Convention Proceedings

Intent: To permit Division III student-athletes in the sports of football and basketball limited participation in varsity contests without being counted toward the 11- or 26-game maximum allowable contests for the individual.

Effective Date: August 1, 1989.

Action: Withdrawn.

NO. 138 INDIVIDUAL CONTEST LIMITATIONS- DIVISION III BASKETBALL

Bylaws: Amend Case No. 251, page 387, relating to Bylaw 3-3-(a)-(5), as follows:

[Division III only]

"Situation: Freshmen may participate in regular-season varsity football and basketball contests at all NCAA member institutions.

"Question: If a student-athlete is a member of both the varsity and junior varsity or freshman teams of the institution, in how many contests against outside competition may the student-athlete participate during the same season?

"Answer: Eleven games in football and 28 in basketball (26 ~~52~~ **halves** if in Division III). The total number of games in each of these sports in which a student-athlete may participate is governed by the limitation on the maximum number of regular intercollegiate contests in which an institution may engage **except as noted above in Division III."**

Source: All nine members of the Ohio Athletic Conference.

Intent: To permit a student-athlete at a Division III institution to participate in not more than 52 halves of both varsity and sub-varsity basketball contests combined.

Effective Date: August 1, 1989.

Action: Defeated by Division III, 71-127.

NO. 139 POSTSEASON TOURNAMENT EXEMPTION- DIVISION III FOOTBALL

Bylaws: Amend Article 3, Section 3-(b), page 91, as follows:

[Division III football only]

"(b) The maximum number of contests in football shall exclude the spring scrimmage; the National Football Foundation benefit game; a conference championship game between division champions of a member conference of 12 or more institutions that is divided into two divisions (of six or more institutions each), each of which conducts round-robin, regular-season competition among the members of that division; **in Division III, a conference-sponsored postseason tournament (i.e., one between teams that are not identified until the end of the preceding regular season), not to exceed two contests for**

Legislative Proposals _____ A-119

any one member institution, and the postseason game or games permitted in Bylaw 3-2-(b)-(2)."

Source: NCAA Division III Steering Committee.

Intent: To permit a Division III member institution's football team to exempt from the applicable contest limitation its participation in a conference-sponsored postseason tournament, not to exceed two contests for any one member institution, between teams that are not identified until the end of the preceding regular season.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: Defeated by Division III after being postponed until the general business session.

NO. 140 POSTSEASON TOURNAMENT EXEMPTION-DIVISION III FOOTBALL

Bylaws: Amend Article 3, Section 3-(b), page 91, as follows:
[Division III football only]

"(b) The maximum number of contests in football shall exclude the spring scrimmage; the National Football Foundation benefit game; a conference championship game between division champions of a member conference of 12 or more institutions that is divided into two divisions (of six or more institutions each), each of which conducts round-robin, regular-season competition among the members of that division; **in Division III, a conference-sponsored postseason tournament, (i.e., one between teams that are not identified until the end of the preceding regular season), not to exceed one contest for any one member institution,** and the postseason game or games permitted in Bylaw 3-2-(b)-(2)."

Source: State University of New York, Albany; Franklin and Marshall College; Ithaca College; Jersey City State College; Norwich University; Plymouth State College, and 41 other members of the Eastern College Athletic Conference.

Intent: To permit a Division III member institution's football team to exempt from the applicable contest limitation its participation in a conference-sponsored postseason tournament, not to exceed one contest for any one member institution, between teams that are not identified until the end of the preceding regular season.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: Approved by Division III after being postponed until the general business session.

NO. 141 CONTEST LIMITATIONS-DIVISION III SOFTBALL

Bylaws: Amend Article 3, Section 3-(q), page 95, as follows:
[Division III only]

"(q) In the sport of softball in Divisions I and II, each date of

A-120 _____ 1989 Convention Proceedings

a tournament shall be counted as one contest, and not more than 10 tournaments may be scheduled in an academic year. **In Division III, each date of a tournament shall be counted as one contest, provided not more than two tournaments fall under this provision during an academic year."**

Source: NCAA Council (Division III Steering Committee).

Intent: In Division III softball, to count each date of a tournament as one contest, provided no more than two tournaments fall under this provision during an academic year.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: Approved by Division III.

NO. 142 PLAYING SEASON-DIVISION III TRACK

Bylaws: Amend Article 3, Section 1-(a)-(3), page 83, as follows:
[Division III only]

"(3) Division III-A maximum of six months (i.e., 26 weeks) for indoor and outdoor track combined, and a maximum of five months (i.e., 21 weeks) for each every other sport, except in those sports for which the National Collegiate Championship is the only NCAA championships opportunity. In the excepted sports, an institution's playing season shall be limited to the same length of playing season as Division I institutions, and this limitation shall be implied in all subsequent legislative references affecting Division III."

Source: NCAA Council (Division III Steering Committee).

Intent: To specify that indoor and outdoor track in Division III are subject to a combined 26-week playing season.

Effective Date: August 1, 1989.

Action: Approved by Division III.

Deregulation/Simplification

NO. 143 RECRUITING CONTACTS

Amend 13.1.4 as follows:

[Federated provision, Divisions I and II, divided vote]

"13.1.4 Permissible Number of Contacts. **Each institution shall be permitted the following maximum number of in-person, off-campus recruiting contacts per prospect [which shall include contacts with the prospect's relatives or legal guardian(s)] prior to and on the occasion when the prospect signs the National Letter of Intent:**

"(a) **At the Prospect's Educational Institution-Institutional staff members may visit a prospect's educational institution on not more than one occasion during a particular week, regardless of the total number of prospects enrolled in the institution. Not more**

Legislative Proposals _____ A-121

than three contacts per prospect shall be allowed at the prospect's educational institution. The visit must receive the approval of the executive officer (or the executive officer's designated representative) of the prospect's educational institution, and

"(b) At Other Sites—Three contacts."

"13.1.4.1 Basketball, Division I Men. Each institution shall be permitted the following maximum number of in-person, off-campus recruiting contacts per prospect [which shall include contacts with the prospect's relatives or legal guardian(s)] prior to and on the occasion when the prospect signs the National Letter of Intent: B 1-2-(a)

"(a) At the Prospect's Educational Institution—A member institution's basketball coaching staff may visit a prospect's educational institution on not more than one occasion during a particular week, regardless of the total number of prospects enrolled in the same institution. The visit must receive the approval of the executive officer (or the executive officer's designated representative) of the prospect's educational institution; and B 1-2-(a)-(2)-(ii)

"(b) At Other Sites—Three contacts. B 1-2-(a)-(2)

"13.1.4.2 Basketball, Division I Women. Each institution shall be permitted the following maximum number of in-person, off-campus recruiting contacts per prospect [which shall include contacts with the prospect's relatives or legal guardian(s)] prior to and on the occasion when the prospect signs the National Letter of Intent: B 1-2-(a)

"(a) At the Prospect's Educational Institution—A member institution's basketball coaching staff may visit a prospect's educational institution on not more than one occasion during a particular week, regardless of the total number of prospects enrolled in the same institution. Not more than three contacts per prospect shall be allowed at the prospect's educational institution. The visit must receive the approval of the executive officer (or the executive officer's designated representative) of the prospect's educational institution, and B 1-2-(a)-(2)-(ii)

"(b) At Other Sites—Three contacts, B 1-2-(a)-(2)

"13.1.4.3 Basketball, Division II. Each institution shall be permitted the following maximum number of in-person, off-campus recruiting contacts per prospect [which shall include contacts with the prospect's relatives or legal guardian(s)] prior to and on the occasion when the prospect signs the National Letter of Intent. B 1-2-(a)

"(a) At the Prospect's Educational Institution—Three contacts with the approval of that institution's executive officer (or the executive officer's designated representative), and B 1-2-(a)-(1)-(iv)

"(b) At Other Sites—Three contacts. B 1-2-(a)-(2)

"13.1.4.4 Football, Divisions I-A and I-AA. Each institution shall be permitted the following maximum number of in-person, off-campus recruiting contacts per prospect [which shall include contacts with the prospect's relatives or legal guardian(s)] prior to and on the occasion when the prospect signs the National Letter of Intent: B 1-2-(a)

"(a) At the Prospect's Educational Institution—A member institution's football coaching staff may visit a prospect's educational institution on not more than one occasion during a particular week, regardless of the total number

of prospects enrolled in the same institution. The visit must receive the approval of the executive officer (or the executive officer's designated representative) of the prospect's educational institution, and B 1-2-(a)-(1)-(ii)

"(b) At Other Sites—Three contacts. B 1-2-(a)-(2)

"13.1.4.5 Football, Division II. Each institution shall be permitted the following maximum number of in-person, off-campus recruiting contacts per prospect [which shall include contacts with the prospect's relatives or legal guardian(s)] prior to and on the occasion when the prospect signs the National Letter of Intent: B 1-2-(a)

"(a) At the Prospect's Educational Institution—Three contacts with the approval of that institution's executive officer (or the executive officer's designated representative), and B 1-2-(a)-(2)-(iv)

"(b) At Other Sites—Three contacts. B 1-2-(a)-(2)

"13.1.4.6 Ice Hockey, Divisions I and II. Each institution shall be permitted the following maximum number of in-person, off-campus recruiting contacts per prospect [which shall include contacts with the prospect's relatives or legal guardian(s)] prior to and on the occasion when the prospect signs the National Letter of Intent: B 1-2-(a)

"(a) At the Prospect's Educational Institution—Three contacts, with the approval of that institution's executive officer (or the executive officer's designated representative), and B 1-2-(a)-(1)

"(b) At Other Sites—Three such contacts. B 1-2-(a)-(2)

"13.1.4.7 All Other Divisions I and II Sports. Each institution shall be permitted the following maximum number of in-person, off-campus recruiting contacts per prospect [which shall include contacts with the prospect's relatives or legal guardian(s)] prior to and on the occasion when the prospect signs the National Letter of Intent: B 1-2-(a)

"(a) At the Prospect's Educational Institution—Two contacts, with the approval of that institution's executive officer (or the executive officer's designated representative); however, in Division I, if the institution is recruiting the same prospect for football or basketball and another sport, the institution shall be limited to one visit to the prospect's educational institution during a particular week, and B 1-2-(a)-(2)

"(b) At Other Sites—Two contacts. B 1-2-(a)-(2)"

[13.1.4.8 through 13.1.4.10, renumbered as 13.1.4.1 through 13.1.4.3, unchanged.]

Source: NCAA Council (Special Committee on Deregulation and Rules Simplification).

Intent: To establish one limitation on the maximum number of recruiting contacts for all Divisions I and II sports.

Effective Date: August 1, 1989.

Rationale: There are now six different rules (football, Division I men's basketball, Division I women's basketball, Division II basketball, ice hockey, and all other sports combined) limiting the number of recruiting contacts in Divisions I and II. This proposal is suggested as a compromise for simplification purposes.

Action: Approved by Divisions I and II.

Legislative Proposals

NO. 144 PROMOTIONAL ACTIVITIES

A. Amend 12.5 as follows:

[Dominant provision, all divisions, common vote]

"12.5 Endorsement of Commercial Products/Businesses **Promotional Activities**

"12.5.1 Advertisements, Posters and Other Printed Materials **Permissible**

"12.5.1.1 *Permissible Activities* **Institutional, Charitable or Educational Promotions.** A member institution or recognized entity thereof (e.g., fraternity, sorority or student government organization) or noninstitutional charitable or educational agency may use the student-athlete's name, picture or appearance to support its charitable or educational activities or to support activities considered incidental to the student-athlete's participation in intercollegiate athletics, provided the following conditions are met:

- "(a) The student-athlete receives written approval to participate from the director of athletics;
- "(b) The specific activity or project in which the student-athlete participates does not involve cosponsorship, advertisement or promotion by a commercial agency other than through the reproduction of the sponsoring company's regular trademark or logo on printed materials such as pictures, posters or calendars;
- "(c) The student-athlete does not miss class;
- "(d) All moneys derived from the activity or project go directly to the member institution or the charitable or educational agency;
- "(e) The student-athlete may accept legitimate and normal expenses from the member institution or charitable or educational agency related to participation in such activity, provided it occurs within the state or, if outside the state, within a 100-mile radius of the member institution's campus, and
- "(f) The student-athlete and an authorized representative of the charitable or educational agency sign a release statement that ensures that the student-athlete's name, image or appearance is used in a manner consistent with the requirements of this section.

"12.5.1.1 *Institutional Promotional Activities.* A member institution, or an officially recognized entity thereof (e.g., fraternity, sorority or student government organization), may use the student-athlete's name or picture to support its charitable or educational activities or to support activities considered incidental to the student-athlete's

participation in intercollegiate athletics, provided such activities:

- "(a) Have the written approval of the institution's athletics director;
- "(b) Are restricted to the use of a student-athlete's name or picture in institutional publications (e.g., game programs) or the sale of other paper products such as team or individual pictures, posters or calendars, and LIC 87-2.4
- "(c) Are not associated with a commercial company or service (other than through the reproduction of the sponsoring company's regular trademark or logo on the item) with regard to the sale of the pictures, posters or calendars CB 44

"12.5.1.1.2 *Charitable or Educational Promotional Activities.* A student-athlete may promote directly a charitable or educational project, provided all funds generated by the use of the student-athlete's name, picture or appearance are distributed directly to the charity or educational agency. A commercial establishment may not sponsor, advertise or promote the charitable or educational project in which the student-athlete is involved. Member institutions are responsible for monitoring and approving the involvement of their student-athletes in such charitable or educational activities. C 3-1-(e)-(4), LIC 87-2.4"

[12.5.1.1.3 through 12.5.1.1.9, renumbered as 12.5.1.1.2 through 12.5.1.1.8; 12.5.1.2; 12.5.2, and 12.5.3 unchanged.]

B. Amend 16.10.2.4 as follows:

[All divisions, common vote]

"16.10.2.4 *Exhibitions.* The institution may not pay the transportation expenses for a student-athlete to put on an exhibition (including speaking engagements) in his or her particular sport. However, the agency sponsoring the exhibition may pay such actual and necessary expenses, provided it is a charitable or educational organization and not related in any way to a commercial product CB 93"

[16.10.2.5 through 16.10.2.7, renumbered as 16.10.2.4 through 16.10.2.6, unchanged.]

C. Amend 16.11.1.4 as follows:

[All divisions, common vote]

"16.11.1.4 *Sponsor of Exhibitions.* An agency sponsoring an exhibition (including speaking engagements) by a student-athlete in his or her sport may pay actual and necessary expenses for the student-athlete's participation, provided the agency is a charitable or educational organization and not related in any way to a commercial product. CB 93"

[16.11.1.5 through 16.11.1.7, renumbered as 16.11.1.4 through 16.11.1.6, unchanged.]

D. Amend 16.11.2.8 as follows:

[All divisions, common vote]

"16.11.2.8 *Sponsors of Exhibitions.* A student-athlete may not receive any expenses to put on an exhibition (including speaking engagements) in his or her particular sport, unless the expenses are provided by a charitable or educational sponsoring agency (not the student-athlete's institution) that is not related in any way to a commercial product. CB 93"

Source: NCAA Council (Special Committee on Deregulation and Rules Simplification).

Intent: To allow member institutions and charitable or educational organizations to utilize a student-athlete's name, picture or appearance to support their charitable or educational activities or to support activities considered incidental to the student-athlete's participation in intercollegiate athletics.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Rationale: The current rule (i.e., the limitation on "paper products") is unduly restrictive, and this proposal would provide institutions more flexibility in allowing their student-athletes to participate in charitable or educational activities.

Action: Approved.

NO. 145 RECRUITING CONTACTS-BANQUETS AND MEETINGS

Amend 13.1.3.6 as follows:

[Federated provision, Divisions I and II, divided vote]

"13.1.3.6 Banquets and Meetings. A member of the basketball or football coaching staff may speak at a high school, preparatory school or two-year college meeting or banquet outside the respective recruiting contact periods, provided:

"(a) The meeting or banquet is open to the general public and is not limited to high school, preparatory school or two-year college athletes;

"(b) (a) The coach does not make a recruiting presentation in conjunction with the appearance, and

"(c) (b) The coach does not have direct contact with any prospect in attendance. CB 193"

Source: NCAA Council (Special Committee on Deregulation and Rules Simplification).

Intent: To permit a Division I or II basketball or football coach to speak at a meeting or banquet outside the recruiting contact periods even though the meeting or banquet is not open to the general public.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Rationale: The current rule prohibits a prospect from attending a meeting or banquet not open to the general public (e.g., an alumni function attended by the prospect's parents) at which a Division I or II basketball or football coach speaks. It is suggested that the intent of the rule is not compromised if the coach does not make a recruiting presentation and has no direct contact with any prospect in attendance.

Action: Approved by Divisions I and II.

NO. 146 TRAVEL TO NCAA CHAMPIONSHIPS AND SPECIAL EVENTS DURING VACATION PERIOD

Amend 16.8.1.4.1 as follows:

[Dominant provision, all divisions, common vote]

"16.8.1.4.1 General Rule. The institution may pay the transportation costs of a student-athlete:

"(a) From the student-athlete's home or the campus directly to the site of the event or the event practice site, and

"(b) From the event site to the campus following the event. CB 87

"16.8.1.4.1.1 Transportation From Site Other Than Home or Campus to Event Site. The institution may provide the transportation costs for a student-athlete to travel directly from a location other than his or her home or the institution's campus to the event or the event practice site, provided:

"(a) The student receives only the actual costs of the transportation and that amount does not exceed the greater of the costs of transportation from the student-athlete's home or the institution's campus to the event or the event practice site, and

"(b) The student who receives such costs travels directly to that site and arrives no more than 48 hours prior to the time the institution's team is scheduled to assemble at that site. CB 87, CB 88

"16.8.1.4.1.2 Transportation From Event Site to Home. If a student-athlete arranges his or her own transportation from the event site to home (or any other site), an institution may provide to the student-athlete the cash equivalent of the transportation costs from the event site to the campus, provided:

"(a) The amount does not exceed the actual costs of the transportation the institution planned to provide if the student had not made his or her own arrangements, and

"(b) The student leaves the event site within 48 hours after the conclusion of the event. CB 87

"16.8.1.4.1.2.1 It is not permissible for an institution to pay round-trip expenses for its students to return from the site at which it is practicing for a special event or an NCAA championship to the student's home (or another site) in order that the students may return to their homes (e.g., for Christmas) and then return to the practice site. In other words, only one such round trip is permitted under the described conditions. CB 87

"16.8.1.4.1.3 Extra Transportation Segment. The institution may pay the transportation costs for a student-athlete from the student's home to the campus following an event conducted during a vacation period during the institution's regular academic year, in addition to paying for expenses incurred under 16.8.1.4.1.1 or 16.8.1.4.1.2, provided the student previously has paid the transportation costs of one round trip (or its equivalent) from the campus to the student's home during that vacation period. CB 87"

"The institution may provide the transportation for a student-athlete to travel from campus to the site of an NCAA championship or special event and back to campus; or if the student-athlete goes home during the vacation period, the institution may pay (in lieu of providing team transportation) the greater of the transportation costs for the student-athlete to travel from:

- "(a) Campus to the event site and back to campus;
- "(b) Campus to the student-athlete's home and back to campus, or
- "(c) The student-athlete's home to the event site and back home."

Source: NCAA Council (Special Committee on Deregulation and Rules Simplification).

Intent: To eliminate the current regulations regarding payment of transportation costs for student-athletes to travel to NCAA championships and special events during vacation periods and to replace them with the proposed alternatives.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Rationale: The current rule is unnecessarily complex and often misunderstood. The proposed legislation would simplify and clarify this area.

Action: Approved.

NO. 147 PRESEASON PRACTICE-FOOTBALL

Amend 17.7.2.1 as follows:

[Federated provision, Divisions I-A, I-AA, II and III football only, divided vote]

"17.7.2.1 First Practice Date. A member institution shall not commence official preseason football practice sessions for the varsity, junior varsity or freshman team prior to the following dates that date which will permit a maximum of 29 'practice opportunities' prior to its first scheduled intercollegiate game, except as provided for student-athletes who are first-time participants in Divisions I-A and I-AA. (See 17.7.2.2) B 3-1-(h), B 3-1-(h)-(6), CB 246

"(a) The 19th day before its first scheduled intercollegiate game, B 3-1-(h)-(2)

"(b) The 22nd day before the next-to-last Saturday in September, or B 3-1-(h)-(2)

"(c) That date which will permit a maximum of 29 'practice opportunities' prior to its first scheduled intercollegiate game. B 3-1-(h)-(2)

[17.7.2.1.1 through 17.7.2.1.3 unchanged.]

Source: NCAA Council (Special Committee on Deregulation and Rules Simplification).

Intent: To eliminate the three options for calculating the permissible starting date for preseason football practice, and to indicate that the first practice date shall be determined on the basis of a maximum of 29 "practice opportunities" prior to the first scheduled intercollegiate contest.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Rationale: The proposal would allow all institutions an equal amount of practice time and would simplify the method for calculating the starting date for preseason football practice.

Action: Approved by all divisions.

A-128 _____ 1989 Convention Proceedings

NO. 148 RESOLUTION: DIVISION I MEN'S BASKETBALL CHAMPIONSHIP

[Division I only]

"Whereas, the Division I Men's Basketball Committee has made a recommendation that was approved in principle by the Executive Committee in December 1988 to restrict automatic qualification for the Division I Men's Basketball Championship;

"Now, Therefore, Be It Resolved, that the Division I membership overturn this action taken by the Executive Committee in its December 1988 meeting and express the Division I membership's opposition to the Men's Basketball Committee's recommendation that automatic qualifying conferences be selected solely on the basis of basketball criteria evaluated for the season just completed."

Source: North Carolina A&T State University.

Action: Defeated by Division I.

NO. 149 RESOLUTION: SPECIAL POSTSEASON FOOTBALL GAME

[Division I-AA football only]

"Whereas, historically black colleges and universities play a significant role in educating young people and have demonstrated certain expertise in creating environments that are conducive to learning for certain individuals, which other institutions find difficult to duplicate; and

"Whereas, the sport of football plays a major role in helping many of these institutions provide these individuals with experiences that enable them to adjust to their environment and ultimately to make significant contributions to society; and

"Whereas, due to circumstances beyond the control of these institutions, the current structure of the NCAA and the financial circumstances in intercollegiate football make it impossible for these institutions to enjoy the revenues available to the majority of Division I institutions that participate in football in that division; and

"Whereas, to be specific, it is impossible for an historically black institution to be the recipient of regular-season exposure and revenue from a major television network and to be invited to participate in a major postseason football bowl game; and

"Whereas, interest has been expressed in allowing the champions of the two conferences that include nearly all of the historically black Division I institutions, the Mid-Eastern Athletic Conference and the Southwestern Athletic Conference, to compete in a postseason football contest without that contest counting against the maximum contest limitations for the two institutions involved and without that contest affecting the conferences' eligibility for the NCAA Division I-AA Football Championship; and

"Whereas, a combination of administrative oversight and confusion regarding the steps to be taken to submit legislation for consid-

Legislative Proposals _____ A-129

eration at this Convention to permit a postseason football contest featuring the champions of these two conferences resulted in the failure to submit such legislation properly in accordance with the November 1, 1988, deadline;

"Now, Therefore, Be It Resolved, that the champions of the Mid-Eastern Athletic Conference and the Southwestern Athletic Conference be authorized to participate in a special pilot contest at the conclusion of their regular football schedules in 1989, without such contest counting toward the 11-game season limitation and without affecting the conference's eligibility for participation in the Division I-AA Football Championship for 1989; and

"Be It Finally Resolved, that if the conferences involved believe that the pilot 1989 game will produce the anticipated and desired revenue and exposure for the historically black institutions, they will submit legislation, in accordance with the November 1, 1989, deadline, to establish the contest on a permanent basis in NCAA Bylaw 3, for vote by the membership at the 1990 Convention."

Source: Mid-Eastern Athletic Conference and Southwestern Athletic Conference.

[NOTE: The parliamentarian has advised the chair that this resolution is out of order. The sponsors have requested that the proposal be circularized with all other amendments to amendments and other proposals at the 1989 Convention to permit the sponsors to challenge the ruling of the chair.]

Action: Withdrawn.

Appendix B

Roll-Call Voting

The following chart reflects the votes of each active member institution and each voting conference on the proposals designated by the Presidents Commission for roll-call voting at the 83rd annual Convention January 8-11, 1989, in San Francisco, California. The votes were registered using a computerized voting procedure.

Voting Member	39 -1	40 VTR	42 VTR	42 RCD	43 -1	43	44	46
Abilene Christian University	Yes	No	—	—	—	—	—	—
Adelphi University	Yes	No	—	—	—	—	—	—
Adrian College	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Akron, University of	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes	No	No	—
Alabama A&M University	Ilq1	No	—	—	—	—	—	—
Alabama, University of, Birmingham	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
Alabama, University of, Huntsville	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Alabama, University of, Tuscaloosa	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
Alabama State University	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Alaska, University of, Anchorage	Yes	Yes	—	—	—	—	—	—
Alaska, University of, Fairbanks	Yes	No	—	—	—	—	—	—
Albany, State University of New York	Yes	No	—	—	—	—	—	No
Albany State College (Georgia)	Yes	No	—	—	—	—	—	—
Albion College	Yes	No	—	—	—	—	—	No
Albright College	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Alcorn State University	Yes	No	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	No
Alfred University	Yes	No	—	—	—	—	—	Yes
Allagheny College	Yes	No	—	—	—	—	—	No
Allentown College of St. Francis De Sales	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Alma College	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
American College of Puerto Rico	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
American International College	Yes	No	—	—	—	—	—	—
American South Athletic Conference	Yes	No	No	No	Yes	No	No	—
American University	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	Yes	No	Yes
Amherst College	Yes	No	—	—	—	—	—	No
Angelo State University	Yes	No	—	—	—	—	—	—
Anna Maria College	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Appalachian State University	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes
Arizona, University of	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	—
Arizona State University	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	Abs.
Arkansas, University of, Fayetteville	Yes	Yes	No	Ilq2	No	No	Yes	No
Arkansas, University of, Little Rock	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes	No
Arkansas State University	Yes	No	No	No	No	Yes	No	Yes
Armstrong State College	Yes	No	—	—	—	—	—	—
Asbury College	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Ashland College	Yes	No	—	—	—	—	—	—
Association of Mid-Centennial Universities	Yes	No	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	No
Assumption College	Yes	No	—	—	—	—	—	—
Atlantic 10 Conference	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	Abs	Abs	Abs.
Atlantic Coast Conference	Yes	Yes	Yes	—	Yes	Ilq1	No	Yes
Auburn University	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
Augsburg College	Yes	Yes	—	—	—	—	—	No
Augusta College	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	—	Yes	Yes	No
Augustana College (Illinois)	Yes	Yes	—	—	—	—	—	No
Augustana College (South Dakota)	Ilq1	No	—	—	—	—	—	—
Aurora University	Yes	Yes	—	—	—	—	—	No
Austin Peay State University	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
Averett College	Yes	No	—	—	—	—	—	Yes
Babson College	No	No	—	—	—	—	—	No
Baldwin-Wallace College	Ilq2	Ilq2	—	—	—	—	—	Yes

Voting Member	30 -1	40 VTR	40 VTR	42 VTR	42 RCD	43 -1	43	44	46
Ball State University	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes	No	No	—
Baptist College	Yes	No	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	No	—
Barry University	Yes	Yes	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Bates College	Yes	No	—	—	—	—	—	—	No
Baylor University	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	No	No	—
Bellarmino College	Yes	Yes	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Beloit College	Yes	No	—	—	—	—	—	—	No
Bemidji State University	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Bentley College	Yes	No	—	—	—	—	—	—	No
Berea College	Yes	No	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Bernard M. Baruch College	Yes	Yes	—	—	—	—	—	—	No
Bethany College (West Virginia)	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	Yes
Bethel College (Minnesota)	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Bethune-Cookman College	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Big East Conference	Yes	No	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	—
Big Eight Conference	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Abs.	Abs.	Yes	No	—
Big Sky Conference	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
Big South Conference	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	—
Big Ten Conference	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	Yes	No	Yes
Big West Conference	Abs.	Yes	Yes	No	Abs.	No	Yes	No	—
Binghamton, State University of New York	Yes	No	—	—	—	—	—	—	No
Blackburn College	Yes	No	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Bloomsburg, University of Pennsylvania	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	—
Boise State University	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes
Boston College	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	—
Boston University	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	Yes	No	—
Bowdoin College	Yes	No	—	—	—	—	—	—	No
Bowie State University	Yes	No	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Bowling Green State University	Yes	No	No	No	No	Yes	No	Yes	—
Bradley University	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	—
Brandeis University	Yes	No	—	—	—	—	—	—	Yes
Bridgeport, University of	Yes	No	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Bridgewater College (Virginia)	Yes	Yes	—	—	—	—	—	—	No
Bridgewater State College (Massachusetts)	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	Yes	No	No	—
Brigham Young University	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	Yes	No	—
Brockport State University College	—	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	—
Brooklyn College	Yes	No	No	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes	—
Brown University	Yes	No	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Bryant College	Yes	Yes	—	—	—	—	—	—	No
Bryn Mawr College	Yes	Yes	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Bucknell University	Yes	No	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	—
Buena Vista College	Yes	No	—	—	—	—	—	—	Yes
Buffalo State College	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	No
Buffalo, State University of New York	Yes	No	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Butler University	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	—
Cabrini College	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
California Collegiate Athletic Association	No	No	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
California, University of, Berkeley	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	—
California, University of, Davis	Yes	No	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
California, University of, Irvine	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	No	Yes	No	—
California, University of, Los Angeles	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	Yes	No	—
California, University of, Riverside	Yes	No	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
California, University of, San Diego	Yes	Yes	—	—	—	—	—	—	No
California, University of, Santa Barbara	Yes	No	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	No	—
California, University of, Santa Cruz	Yes	Yes	—	—	—	—	—	—	No
California Institute of Technology	Yes	No	—	—	—	—	—	—	No
California Lutheran University	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
California Polytechnic State University, San Luis Obispo	Yes	No	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
California State Polytechnic University, Pomona	Yes	Yes	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
California State University, Bakersfield	No	No	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
California State University, Chico	Yes	No	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
California State University, Dominguez Hills	Yes	No	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
California State University, Fresno	No	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	Yes	No	—
California State University, Fullerton	Yes	Yes	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
California State University, Hayward	Yes	Yes	—	—	—	—	—	—	—

Voting Member	30 -1	40 VTR	40 VTR	42 VTR	42 RCD	43 -1	43	44	46
California State University, Long Beach	No	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes	No	—
California State University, Los Angeles	Yes	No	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
California State University, Northridge	Yes	No	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
California State University, Sacramento	Yes	No	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
California State University, San Bernardino	Yes	No	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
California State University, Stanislaus	Yes	Yes	—	—	—	—	—	—	No
California University of Pennsylvania	Yes	Yes	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Calvin College	Yes	No	—	—	—	—	—	—	No
Cameron University	Yes	No	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Campbell University	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	—
Canisius College	Yes	No	No	Yes	—	Yes	Yes	Yes	—
Capital University	Yes	Yes	—	—	—	—	—	—	No
Carleton College	Yes	Yes	—	—	—	—	—	—	No
Carnegie-Mellon University	Yes	No	—	—	—	—	—	—	Yes
Carroll College (Wisconsin)	Yes	Yes	—	—	—	—	—	—	No
Carthage College	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	Yes
Case Western Reserve University	Yes	No	—	—	—	—	—	—	No
Castleton State College	No	No	—	—	—	—	—	—	No
Catholic University	Yes	Yes	—	—	—	—	—	—	No
Centenary College	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	—
Central College (Iowa)	Yes	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	No
Central Connecticut State University	Yes	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	—
Central Florida, University of	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	—
Central Intercollegiate Athletic Association	Yes	No	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Central Michigan University	Yes	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	—
Central Missouri State University	Yes	No	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Central State University (Oklahoma)	Yes	No	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Centre College	Yes	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Chaminade University	Yes	No	—	—	—	—	—	No	No
Chapman College	No	No	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Cheyney University of Pennsylvania	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Chicago, University of	Yes	No	—	—	—	—	—	—	Yes
Chicago State University	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes	No	—
Christopher Newport College	Yes	No	—	—	—	—	—	—	No
Cincinnati, University of	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	—
Citadel, The	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	—
City University of New York Athletic Conference	Yes	No	—	—	—	—	—	—	No
Claremont McKenna-Harvey Mudd-Scripps Colleges	Yes	Yes	—	—	—	—	—	—	No
Clanion University of Pennsylvania	Yes	No	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Clark Atlanta University	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Clark University (Massachusetts)	Yes	Yes	—	—	—	—	—	—	Yes
Clarkson University	No	No	—	—	—	—	—	—	Yes
Clemson University	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	—
Cleveland State University	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Coastal Carolina College of the University of South Carolina	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	—
Coe College	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Colby College	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Colby-Sawyer College	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Colgate University	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	—
College Athletic Conference	Yes	No	—	—	—	—	—	—	No
College Conference of Illinois and Wisconsin	Yes	Yes	—	—	—	—	—	—	No
Colonial Athletic Association	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	—
Colorado, University of	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	—
Colorado College	Yes	Yes	—	—	—	—	—	—	No
Colorado School of Mines	Yes	No	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Colorado State University	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	—
Columbia University-Barnard College	Yes	No	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	No	—
Columbus College	No	Yes	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Concordia College (Illinois)	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Concordia College, Moorhead	Yes	Yes	—	—	—	—	—	—	No
Concordia College (New York)	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Connecticut, University of	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	—
Connecticut College	Yes	No	—	—	—	—	—	—	No
Continental Divide Conference	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Coppin State College	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—

Voting Member	39 -1	40 VTR	40 VTR	42 VTR	42 RCD	43 -1	43	44	48
Cornell College	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Cornell University	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	No	—
Cortland State University College	Yes	No	—	—	—	—	—	—	No
Craighead University	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Curry College	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Dartmouth College	Yes	No	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No	Yes
Davidson College	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	—
Davis and Elkins College	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Dayton, University of	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	Yes	No	Yes	—
Delaware, University of	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	—
Delaware State College	Yes	No	No	No	Yes	No	No	Yes	—
Delaware Valley College	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Delta State University	Yes	No	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Denison University	Yes	Yes	—	—	—	—	—	—	No
Denver, University of	Yes	No	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
DePaul University	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	Yes	No	Yes
DePauw University	Yes	Yes	—	—	—	—	—	—	No
Detroit, University of	Yes	No	No	No	No	No	Yes	No	—
Dickinson College	Yes	No	—	—	—	—	—	—	No
District of Columbia, University of	No	No	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Dixie Intercollegiate Athletic Conference	Yes	No	—	—	—	—	—	—	No
Dowling College	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Drake University	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	Yes	No	—
Drew University	Yes	No	—	—	—	—	—	—	Yes
Drexel University	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No	Yes
Dubuque, University of	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Duke University	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	—
Duquesne University	Yes	No	No	No	No	Yes	No	No	—
Earlham College	Yes	Yes	—	—	—	—	—	—	No
East Carolina University	Yes	No	No	Yes	No	No	Yes	No	—
East Coast Conference	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	—
East Stroudsburg University of Pennsylvania	Yes	Yes	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
East Tennessee State University	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	—
East Texas State University	Yes	No	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Eastern College Athletic Conference	Yes	Abs.	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Eastern College Athletic Conference-North	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	—
Eastern Connecticut State University	Yes	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	No
Eastern Illinois University	Yes	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	—
Eastern Kentucky University	Yes	No	No	No	No	No	Yes	No	—
Eastern Mennonite College	Yes	Yes	—	—	—	—	—	—	No
Eastern Michigan University	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	No	—
Eastern Montana College	No	No	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Eastern New Mexico University	Yes	No	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Eastern States Athletic Conference	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Eastern Washington University	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No
Eckerd College	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Edinboro University of Pennsylvania	Yes	No	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Elizabeth City State University	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Elizabethtown College	Yes	No	—	—	—	—	—	—	Yes
Elmhurst College	Yes	Yes	—	—	—	—	—	—	No
Elmira College	Yes	No	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Emerson College	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Emmanuel College	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Emory and Henry College	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Emory University	Yes	Yes	—	—	—	—	—	—	Yes
Eureka College	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Evansville, University of	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	—
Fairfield University	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	—
Fairleigh Dickinson University, Madison	Yes	Yes	—	—	—	—	—	—	No
Fairleigh Dickinson University, Teaneck	Yes	No	No	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	—
Fayetteville State University	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Ferris State University	Yes	No	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Ferrum College	Yes	No	—	—	—	—	—	—	No
Findlay College	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Fisk University	Yes	No	—	—	—	—	—	—	No

Voting Member	39 -1	40 VTR	40 VTR	42 VTR	42 RCD	43 -1	43	44	48
Fitchburg State College	Yes	No	—	—	—	—	—	—	No
Florida, University of	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	—
Florida A&M University	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
Florida Atlantic University	—	Yes	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Florida Institute of Technology	Yes	No	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Florida International University	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No
Florida Southern College	Yes	No	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Florida State University	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes
Fordham University	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No
Fort Hays State University	Yes	No	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Fort Valley State College	Yes	No	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Framingham State College	Yes	No	—	—	—	—	—	—	No
Franklin and Marshall College	Yes	Yes	—	—	—	—	—	—	Yes
Franklin Pierce College	Yes	No	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Fredonia State University College	Yes	No	—	—	—	—	—	—	No
Frostburg State University	Yes	Yes	—	—	—	—	—	—	No
Furman University	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes	—
Gallaudet University	Yes	No	—	—	—	—	—	—	No
Gannon University	Yes	No	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Gateway Collegiate Athletic Conference	Yes	No	No	Abs.	No	No	Yes	Abs	Abs
Geneseo State University College	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	No
George Mason University	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No
George Washington University	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	No	Yes	No	—
Georgetown University	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	—
Georgia, University of	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No
Georgia Institute of Technology	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	—
Georgia Southern College	Yes	Yes	No	Abs	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
Georgia State University	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	—
Gettysburg College	Yes	No	—	—	—	—	—	—	Yes
Glassboro State College	Yes	No	—	—	—	—	—	—	No
Gonzaga University	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes
Gordon College	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Goucher College	Yes	No	—	—	—	—	—	—	Yes
Grambling State University	Yes	No	No	—	—	No	Yes	Yes	No
Grand Valley State University	Yes	No	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Great Lakes Intercollegiate Athletic Conference	Yes	No	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Great Lakes Valley Conference	Yes	No	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Greensboro College	Yes	No	—	—	—	—	—	—	No
Grimm College	Yes	No	—	—	—	—	—	—	No
Grove City College	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Gulf South Conference	Yes	Yes	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Gustavus Adolphus College	Yes	No	—	—	—	—	—	—	No
Hamilton College	Yes	No	—	—	—	—	—	—	No
Hamline University	Yes	Yes	—	—	—	—	—	—	Yes
Hampden-Sydney College	Yes	No	—	—	—	—	—	—	No
Hampton University	Yes	No	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Hardin-Simmons University	—	—	No	—	—	—	—	—	—
Hartford, University of	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	—
Hartwick College	Yes	Yes	—	—	—	—	—	—	Yes
Harvard University	Yes	No	No	No	No	No	Yes	No	—
Haverford College	Yes	No	—	—	—	—	—	—	No
Hawaii, University of	—	—	Yes	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	No
Heidelberg College	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Herbert H. Lehman College	Yes	Yes	—	—	—	—	—	—	No
High Country Athletic Conference	Yes	Yes	No	—	No	Yes	Yes	No	—
Hillsdale College	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Hiram College	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Hobart and William Smith Colleges	Yes	Yes	—	—	—	—	—	—	Yes
Hofstra University	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	—
Hollins College	Yes	Yes	—	—	—	—	—	—	No
Holy Cross College	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	No	No	Yes	No	—
Hope College	Yes	No	—	—	—	—	—	—	No
Houston, University of	Yes	No	Yes	No	No	No	Yes	No	—
Houston Baptist University	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	—
Howard University	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	—

Voting Member	30 -1	40 VTR	40 VTR	42 VTR	42 VTR	42 RCO	43 -1	43	44	45
Humboldt State University	Yes	No	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Hunter College	Yes	No	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	No
Idaho, University of	Ilg1	Yes	No	No	No	No	Yes	No	No	—
Idaho State University	No	Yes	No	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	No	—
Illinois, University of, Champaign	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	—
Illinois, University of, Chicago	Yes	No	No	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	No	—
Illinois Benedictine College	Yes	Yes	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	Yes
Illinois College	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	—
Illinois State University	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	—
Illinois Wesleyan University	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Immaculata College	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Independent College Athletic Conference	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Indiana State University	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	—
Indiana University of Pennsylvania	Yes	Yes	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Indiana University, Bloomington	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	—
Indiana University-Purdue University, Fort Wayne	No	No	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Indianapolis, University of	Yes	No	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Iona College	Yes	No	No	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	No	—
Iowa Intercollegiate Athletic Conference	Yes	No	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	No
Iowa, University of	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	No	No	Yes	—
Iowa State University	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	—	—
Ithaca College	Yes	Yes	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	Abs
Ivy Group	Yes	No	No	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	No	—
Jackson State University	Yes	No	No	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No	—
Jacksonville State University	Yes	No	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Jacksonville University	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	No	—
James Madison University	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	—
Jersey City State College	Yes	No	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	No
John Carroll University	Yes	Yes	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	Yes
John Jay College of Criminal Justice	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	No
Johns Hopkins University	Yes	Yes	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	Yes
Johnson C. Smith University	Yes	No	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Johnson State College	Yes	No	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Junata College	Yes	No	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	Yes
Kalamazoo College	Yes	Abs	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	Yes
Kansas, University of	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	Yes	No	No	—
Kansas State University	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	—
Kean College	Yes	Yes	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	No
Kearney State College	Yes	No	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Keene State College	Yes	No	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Kent State University	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	—
Kentucky, University of	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	—
Kentucky State University	Yes	No	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Kentucky Wesleyan College	Yes	No	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Kenyon College	Yes	No	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	No
King's College (Pennsylvania)	Yes	Yes	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	Yes
Knox College	Yes	Yes	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	No
Knoxville College	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Kutztown University of Pennsylvania	Yes	No	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
La Salle University	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No	—
La Verne, University of	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Lafayette College	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	—
Lake Forest College	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Lake Superior State University	Yes	Yes	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Lamar University	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	Yes	—
Lawrence University	Yes	No	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	No
Le Moyne College	Yes	No	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Lebanon Valley College	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Lehigh University	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	—
LeMoyne-Owen College	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Lewis and Clark College	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	Yes
Lewis University	Yes	No	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Liberty University	No	No	No	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes	No	—
Lincoln University (Missouri)	Yes	No	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Lincoln University (Pennsylvania)	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—

Voting Member	30 -1	40 VTR	40 VTR	42 VTR	42 VTR	42 RCO	43 -1	43	44	45
Livingston University	Yes	No	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Livingstone College	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Lock Haven University of Pennsylvania	Yes	No	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Lone Star Conference	Yes	No	No	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	No	—
Long Island University-Brooklyn Center	Yes	No	No	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	No	—
Long Island University/C W Post Campus	Yes	Yes	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Longwood College	Yes	No	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	No
Loras College	Yes	No	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Louisville, University of	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	Yes	No	Yes	—
Louisiana State University	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	—
Louisiana Tech University	No	No	No	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	No	—
Lowell, University of	Yes	No	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Loyola College (Maryland)	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	—
Loyola Marymount University	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	No	—
Loyola University (Illinois)	No	No	No	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	No	—
Luther College	Yes	No	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	No
Lycoming College	Yes	Yes	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	No
Lynchburg College	Yes	Yes	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	No
Macalester College	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
MacMurray College	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Maine, University of, Farmington	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Maine, University of, Orono	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Ilg1	Yes	No	—
Maine Maritime Academy	Yes	No	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	No
Manhattan College	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	—
Manhattanville College	Yes	No	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	Yes
Mankato State University	Yes	Yes	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Mansfield University of Pennsylvania	Yes	Yes	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Marietta College	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	No
Marist College	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	No	Yes	No	No	—
Marquette University	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	No	Yes	No	No	—
Marshall University	Yes	No	No	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No	—
Mary Baldwin College	Yes	Yes	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	No
Mary Washington College	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Maryland, University of, Baltimore County	Yes	Yes	Ilg2	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	—
Maryland, University of, College Park	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	—
Maryland, University of, Eastern Shore	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	—	—
Marymount University	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	No
Maryville College (Missouri)	No	No	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	No
Maryville College (Tennessee)	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Marywood College	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Massachusetts, University of, Amherst	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	—
Massachusetts, University of, Boston	Yes	Yes	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	No
Massachusetts Institute of Technology	Yes	Abs	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	No
Massachusetts State College Athletic Conference	Yes	Yes	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Massachusetts Maritime Academy	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
McNeese State University	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	—
Medgar Evers College	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	—
Memphis State University	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Menlo College	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	—
Mercer University	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Mercy College	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Mercyhurst College	Yes	No	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Meredith College	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Merrimack College	Yes	No	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Messiah College	Yes	Yes	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	Yes
Methodist College	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Metro Atlantic Athletic Conference	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	No	No	—
Metropolitan Collegiate Athletic Conference	Yes	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	—
Metropolitan State College	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Metropolitan State College	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	—
Miami, University of (Florida)	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Miami University (Ohio)	Yes	No	No	No	No	No	No	Yes	No	—
Michigan, University of	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	No	Yes	No	—
Michigan Intercollegiate Athletic Association	Yes	No	No	No	No	No	No	Yes	No	No
Michigan State University	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	Yes	No	—
Michigan Technological University	Yes	Yes	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—

Voting Member	39	40	40	42	42	42	43	43	44	46
	-1	VTR	VTR	RCD	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1
Mid-American Athletic Conference	Yes	No	No	No	No	No	Yes	No	No	—
Mid-Eastern Athletic Conference	Yes	No	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	—
Middle Atlantic States Conference	Yes	Yes	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Middle Tennessee State University	Yes	No	—	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	No	Yes
Middlebury College	Yes	Yes	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	No
Midwest Athletic Conference for Women	Yes	No	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	No
Midwest Collegiate Athletic Conference	Yes	Yes	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	No
Midwestern Collegiate Conference	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	—
Miles College	Yes	No	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Millersville University of Pennsylvania	Yes	No	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Millikin University	Yes	Yes	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	No
Mills College	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	No
Millsaps College	Yes	Yes	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	No
Minnesota, University of, Duluth	Yes	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Minnesota, University of, Twin Cities	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	Yes	No	Yes	—
Minnesota Intercollegiate Athletic Conference	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Mississippi, University of	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	—
Mississippi College	Yes	No	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Mississippi State University	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	—
Mississippi University for Women	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Mississippi Valley State University	Yes	No	No	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	No	—
Missouri, University of, Columbia	Yes	No	No	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	—
Missouri, University of, Rolla	Yes	No	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Missouri, University of, St. Louis	No	No	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Missouri Intercollegiate Athletic Association	Ilg1	No	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Missouri Southern State College	Yes	No	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Missouri Valley Conference	Yes	No	No	No	No	Yes	No	No	—	—
Missouri Western State College	Yes	No	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Mt. Holyoke College	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Monmouth College (Illinois)	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Monmouth College (New Jersey)	Yes	No	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	No	—	—
Montana, University of	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes	—
Montana State University	Yes	Yes	Yes	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Montclair State College	Yes	No	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	No
Moravian College	No	Yes	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	Yes
Morehead State University	Yes	Ilg1	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	No	—	—
Morehouse College	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Morgan State University	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	No	—	—
Morningside College	Yes	No	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Morris Brown College	No	No	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Mount Holyoke College	Yes	Yes	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	No
Mount St. Mary's College (New York)	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Mount St. Mary's College (Maryland)	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	—	—
Mount St. Vincent, College of	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Mount Union College	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Muhlenberg College	Yes	No	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	Yes
Murray State University	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No	—
Muskingum College	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Nazareth College (New York)	Yes	Yes	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	Yes
Nebraska, University of, Lincoln	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	Yes	No	No	—
Nebraska, University of, Omaha	Yes	No	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Nebraska Wesleyan University	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Nevada, University of, Las Vegas	No	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	No	—
Nevada, University of, Reno	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	No	—
New England College	Yes	Yes	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	No
New England Collegiate Conference	Yes	No	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
New England Women's 8	Yes	Yes	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	No
New Hampshire, University of	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes	—
New Hampshire College	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
New Haven, University of	Yes	No	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
New Jersey Athletic Conference	Yes	No	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	No
New Jersey Institute of Technology	Yes	No	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	Yes
New Mexico, University of	Yes	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	—
New Mexico State University	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No	—
New Orleans, University of	Yes	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	—

Voting Member	39	40	40	42	42	42	43	43	44	46
	-1	VTR	VTR	RCD	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1
New Paltz State University College	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
New Rochelle, College of	Yes	Yes	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
New South Women's Athletic Conference	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No
New York, City College of	Yes	No	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	No
New York Institute of Technology	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
New York Maritime College, State University of	Yes	No	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	Ilg1
New York State Women's Collegiate Athletic Conference	Yes	Yes	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	No
New York University	Yes	Yes	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	Yes
Niagara University	Yes	No	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	—
Nicholls State University	Yes	No	No	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	No	—
Nichols College	Yes	No	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	Ilg2
North Central Intercollegiate Athletic Conference	Yes	No	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Northern California Athletic Conference	Yes	Yes	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Norfolk State University	Yes	No	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
North Adams State College	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	No
North Alabama, University of	Yes	No	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
North Carolina, University of, Asheville	Yes	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes	—
North Carolina, University of, Chapel Hill	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes	—
North Carolina, University of, Charlotte	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	—
North Carolina, University of, Greensboro	Yes	Yes	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
North Carolina, University of, Wilmington	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	—
North Carolina A&T State University	Yes	No	No	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	No	—
North Carolina Central University	Yes	No	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
North Carolina State University	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	—
North Carolina Wesleyan College	Yes	No	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	No
North Central College	Yes	No	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	No
North Coast Athletic Conference	Yes	Yes	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	No
North Dakota, University of	Yes	No	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
North Dakota State University	Yes	No	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
North Park College	Yes	Yes	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	No
North Star Conference	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	Yes	No	No	—
North Texas, University of	Yes	No	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	—
Northeast Conference	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No	—
Northeast Louisiana University	Yes	No	No	No	No	No	Yes	No	No	—
Northeast Missouri State University	Yes	No	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Northeast-10 Conference	Yes	Ilg1	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Northeastern University	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	—
Northern Arizona University	Yes	No	No	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	No	—
Northern Colorado, University of	Yes	No	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Northern Illinois University	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	No	—
Northern Iowa, University of	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	—
Northern Kentucky University	Yes	No	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Northern Michigan University	Yes	No	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Northwest Missouri State University	Yes	No	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Northwestern State University (Louisiana)	Yes	No	No	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	No	—
Northwestern University	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	—
Norwich University	Yes	No	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Notre Dame, College of (California)	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Notre Dame, College of (Maryland)	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	No
Notre Dame, University of	Yes	No	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	—
Oakland University	Yes	No	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Oberlin College	Yes	No	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	No
Occidental College	Yes	Yes	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	No
Oglethorpe University	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Ohio Athletic Conference	Yes	No	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	No
Ohio Northern University	Yes	Yes	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	No
Ohio University	Yes	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	—
Ohio State University	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	Yes	No	Yes	—
Ohio Valley Conference	Yes	No	No	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	No	—
Ohio Wesleyan University	—	Yes	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	No
Oklahoma, University of	No	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	No	No	No	—
Oklahoma State University	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	—
Old Dominion Athletic Conference	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Old Dominion University	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	—
Olivet College	Yes	Yes	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	No

Voting Member	39 -1	40	40 VTR	42	42 VTR	42 ACD	43 -1	43	44	46
Oneonta State University College	Yes	Yes	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	No
Oral Roberts University	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	—
Oregon University of	Yes	No	No	No	No	No	No	Yes	No	—
Oregon State University	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	—
Oswego State University College	Abs.	Abs.	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	No
Otterbein College	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	No
Our Lady of the Elms, College of	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Pace University	Yes	No	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Pacific University of the	—	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	No	—
Pacific-10 Conference	No	Yes	Yes	Abs	Abs	Abs	Yes	No	No	—
Paine College	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Pan American University	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Parks College of St. Louis University	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Pembroke State University	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Pennsylvania University of	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	—
Pennsylvania State University	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	—
Pennsylvania State University-Behrend College	Yes	Yes	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	Yes
Pennsylvania State Athletic Conference	Ilq1	Yes	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Pepperdine University	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	—
Pfeiffer College	No	No	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Philadelphia College of Textiles and Science	Yes	No	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Pine Manor College	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Pittsburg State University	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Pittsburgh, University of	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	—
Pittsburgh, University of, Johnstown	Yes	Yes	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Plattsburgh State University College	Yes	No	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	No
Plymouth State College	Yes	Yes	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	No
Polytechnic University (New York)	Yes	No	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	No
Pomona-Pitzer Colleges	Yes	Yes	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	No
Portland, University of	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	—
Portland State University	Yes	No	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Potsdam State University College	Yes	No	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	No
Prairie View A&M University	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Presidents' Athletic Conference	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Princeton University	Yes	No	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	No	No	—
Principia College	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Providence College	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	No	—
Puget Sound, University of	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Purdue University	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	No	No	Yes	—
Queens College	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Quincy College	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Quinnipiac College	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Radford University	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No	No	—
Ramapo College	Yes	Yes	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	Yes
Randolph-Macon College	Yes	Yes	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Randolph-Macon Woman's College	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Redlands, University of	Yes	No	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	No
Regis College (Colorado)	Yes	No	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Regis College (Massachusetts)	Yes	Yes	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	Ilq2
Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute	No	Yes	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	Yes
Rhode Island, University of	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	No	—
Rhode Island College	Yes	Yes	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	No
Rhodes College	Yes	No	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	Yes
Rice University	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	—
Richmond, University of	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	—
Rider College	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	—
Ripon College	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Roanoke College	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Robert Morris College	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	—
Rochester, University of	Yes	No	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	Yes
Rochester Institute of Technology	Yes	Yes	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	Yes
Rockford College	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Roger Williams College	Yes	Yes	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	No
Rollins College	Yes	Abs	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Rose-Hulman Institute of Technology	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—

Voting Member	39 -1	40	40 VTR	42	42 VTR	42 ACD	43 -1	43	44	46
Rust College	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Rutgers University, Camden	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Rutgers University, New Brunswick	No	Yes	No	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	—
Rutgers University, Newark	Yes	No	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	No
Sacred Heart University	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Saginaw Valley State University	Yes	No	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
St. Anselm College	Yes	No	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
St. Augustine's College	Yes	No	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
St. Benedict College of	Yes	Yes	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	No
St. Bonaventure University	Yes	No	Yes	No	No	No	Yes	No	No	—
St. Catherine, College of	Yes	Yes	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	No
St. Cloud State University	Yes	No	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
St. Elizabeth, College of	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
St. Francis College (New York)	Yes	No	—	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	—
St. Francis College (Pennsylvania)	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No	—
St. John Fisher College	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
St. John's University (Minnesota)	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
St. John's University (New York)	Yes	No	No	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	—
St. Joseph's College (Indiana)	Yes	Yes	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
St. Joseph's College (Maine)	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
St. Joseph's University (Pennsylvania)	—	—	—	—	Yes	No	—	—	—	—
St. Lawrence University	No	Yes	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	Yes
St. Leo College	Yes	No	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
St. Louis University	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	—
St. Mary's College (California)	Yes	Yes	—	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	—
St. Mary's College of Maryland	Yes	Yes	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	No
St. Mary's College (Minnesota)	Yes	No	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	No
St. Michael's College	Yes	Yes	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
St. Norbert College	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
St. Olaf College	Yes	Yes	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	Yes
St. Paul's College	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
St. Peter's College	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	—
St. Scholastica, College of	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
St. Thomas, College of (Minnesota)	Abs.	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	No
Salem State College	Yes	Yes	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	No
Salisbury State University	Yes	No	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	No
Salve Regina College	Yes	Yes	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	No
Sam Houston State University	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	—
Samford University	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	—
San Diego, University of	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes	—
San Diego State University	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	—
San Francisco, University of	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	—
San Francisco State University	Yes	No	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
San Jose State University	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	—
Santa Clara University	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	—
Savannah State College	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Scranton, University of	Yes	No	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	No
Seattle Pacific University	Yes	Yes	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Selon Hall University	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	—
Shaw University (North Carolina)	Yes	No	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Shenandoah College	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Shippensburg University of Pennsylvania	Yes	No	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Siena College	—	No	No	—	No	Yes	—	—	—	—
Simmons College	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	No
Simpson College	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Skidmore College	Yes	No	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	No
Slippery Rock University of Pennsylvania	Yes	No	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Smith College	Yes	Yes	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	No
Southern California Intercollegiate Athletic Conference	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Sonoma State University	Yes	No	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
South, University of the	Yes	Abs	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	No
South Alabama, University of	Yes	No	No	—	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	—
South Carolina, University of	Yes	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	—
South Carolina State College	Yes	No	No	No	No	No	Yes	No	No	—
South Dakota, University of	Yes	No	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—

Voting Member	39 -1	40 VTR	41 VTR	42 VTR	43 RCO	44 -1	45 44	46
South Dakota State University	Yes	Yes	—	—	—	—	—	—
South Florida University of	Yes	Yes	No	—	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
Southampton Campus of Long Island University	Yes	Yes	—	—	—	—	—	—
Southeast Missouri State University	Yes	No	—	—	—	—	—	—
Southeastern Conference	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No
Southeastern Louisiana University	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Southeastern Massachusetts University	Yes	Yes	—	—	—	—	—	No
Southern California University of	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes
Southern Conference	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Southern Connecticut State University	Yes	No	—	—	—	—	—	—
Southern Illinois University, Carbondale	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No
Southern Illinois University, Edwardsville	Yes	Yes	—	—	—	—	—	—
Southern Indiana University of	Yes	No	—	—	—	—	—	—
Southern Intercollegiate Athletic Conference	Yes	No	—	—	—	—	—	—
Southern Maine University of	Yes	No	—	—	—	—	—	No
Southern Methodist University	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes
Southern Mississippi University of	Yes	No	No	No	No	No	Yes	No
Southern University, Baton Rouge	Yes	No	No	No	No	No	Yes	No
Southern Utah State College	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
Southland Conference	Yes	No	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	No
Southwest Athletic Conference	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No
Southwest Baptist University	Yes	No	—	—	—	—	—	—
Southwest Missouri State University	Yes	No	No	No	No	No	Yes	No
Southwest Texas State University	Yes	No	No	No	No	No	Yes	Yes
Southwestern Athletic Conference	Yes	No	No	No	No	No	Yes	No
Southwestern Louisiana University of	Yes	No	No	No	No	Yes	No	No
Spring Garden College	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Springfield College	Yes	Yes	—	—	—	—	—	—
Stanford University	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No
State University of New York Athletic Conference	Yes	No	—	—	—	—	—	No
Staten Island College of	Yes	No	—	—	—	—	—	No
Stephen F. Austin State University	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	No	No	No
Stetson University	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No
Stevens Institute of Technology	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Stillman College	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Stockton State College	Yes	No	—	—	—	—	—	No
Stonehill College	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Stony Brook State University of New York	Yes	No	—	—	—	—	—	No
Suffolk University	Yes	Yes	—	—	—	—	—	No
Sun Belt Conference	Yes	Yes	No	Abs	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
Sunshine State Conference	Yes	No	—	—	—	—	—	—
Susquehanna University	Yes	Yes	—	—	—	—	—	No
Swarthmore College	Yes	Yes	—	—	—	—	—	No
Sweet Briar College	Yes	No	—	—	—	—	—	No
Syracuse University	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes	No	Yes
Tampa University of	Yes	No	—	—	—	—	—	—
Temple University	No	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	Yes	No
University of Tennessee, Chattanooga	Yes	No	No	No	No	No	Yes	No
University of Tennessee, Knoxville	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	Yes	No
University of Tennessee, Martin	Yes	No	—	—	—	—	—	—
Tennessee State University	—	—	No	—	—	Yes	Yes	No
Tennessee Technological University	Yes	No	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	No
Texas University of Arlington	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes
Texas University of Austin	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No
Texas University of El Paso	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
Texas University of San Antonio	Yes	No	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	No
Texas A&I University	Yes	No	—	—	—	—	—	—
Texas A&M University	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes
Texas Christian University	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
Texas Southern University	Yes	No	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	No
Texas Tech University	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No
Texas Woman's University	Yes	No	—	—	—	—	—	—
Thiel College	Yes	No	—	—	—	—	—	No
Thomas College	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Toledo, University of	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	No	No	No

Voting Member	39 -1	40 VTR	41 VTR	42 VTR	43 RCO	44 -1	45 44	46
Towson State University	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	—
Trans America Athletic Conference	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No
Trenton State College	Yes	No	—	—	—	—	—	No
Trinity College (Connecticut)	Yes	No	—	—	—	—	—	Ilg2
Trinity College (Illinois)	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Trinity University (Texas)	Yes	Yes	—	—	—	—	—	No
Troy State University	Yes	No	—	—	—	—	—	No
Tufts University	Yes	No	—	—	—	—	—	No
Tulane University	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes	No	No	No
Tulsa University of	Yes	No	No	No	No	No	No	—
Tuskegee University	Ilg1	No	—	—	—	—	—	—
U.S. Air Force Academy	Abs	Abs	Abs	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Abs
U.S. Coast Guard Academy	Yes	No	—	No	No	No	Yes	No
U.S. International University	Yes	No	—	—	—	—	—	No
U.S. Merchant Marine Academy	No	No	—	—	—	—	—	No
U.S. Military Academy	Yes	Abs	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes
U.S. Naval Academy	Yes	Abs	Abs	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes
Union College (New York)	Yes	No	—	—	—	—	—	No
University Athletic Association	Yes	No	—	—	—	—	—	Yes
Upper Iowa University	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Upsala College	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Ursinus College	Yes	Yes	—	—	—	—	—	Yes
Utah, University of	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes	No	Yes	No
Utah State University	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No
Utica College	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Valdosta State College	—	No	—	—	—	—	—	—
Valparaiso University	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	—
Vanderbilt University	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes
Vassar College	Yes	Yes	—	—	—	—	—	No
Vermont University of	Yes	No	No	No	No	Yes	No	No
Villanova University	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	No	No	Yes	—
Virginia University of	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No	Yes
Virginia Commonwealth University	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	Yes	No
Virginia Military Institute	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes
Virginia Polytechnic Institute	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes
Virginia State University	Yes	No	—	—	—	—	—	—
Virginia Union University	Yes	No	—	—	—	—	—	—
Virginia Wesleyan College	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Wabash College	Yes	No	—	—	—	—	—	No
Wagner College	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Wake Forest University	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes
Wartburg College	Yes	Yes	—	—	—	—	—	No
Washburn University	No	No	—	—	—	—	—	—
Washington University of	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
Washington and Jefferson College	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Washington and Lee University	Yes	Yes	—	—	—	—	—	No
Washington College (Maryland)	Yes	No	—	—	—	—	—	Yes
Washington State University	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	No	No
Washington University (Missouri)	Yes	No	—	—	—	—	—	Yes
Wayne State College (Nebraska)	Yes	No	—	—	—	—	—	—
Wayne State University (Michigan)	Yes	No	—	—	—	—	—	—
Weber State College	Yes	No	No	No	Yes	No	Yes	No
Webster University	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Wellesley College	Yes	Yes	—	—	—	—	—	No
Wells College	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Wentworth Institute of Technology	Yes	No	—	—	—	—	—	No
Wesley College	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Wesleyan University	Yes	Yes	—	—	—	—	—	No
West Chester University of Pennsylvania	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No
West Coast Athletic Conference	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No
West Georgia College	Yes	No	—	—	—	—	—	—
West Texas State University	Yes	No	—	—	—	—	—	—
West Virginia University	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
Western Athletic Conference	Yes	Abs	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No	Yes
Western Carolina University	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes

Voting Member	39	40	40	42	42	42	43	43	44	48
	-1		VTR		VTR	RCO	-1			
Western Connecticut State University	Yes	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	No
Western Illinois University	Yes	No	No	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	No	—
Western Kentucky University	Yes	No	No	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No	—
Western Maryland College	Yes	Yes	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	No
Western Michigan University	Yes	No	No	No	No	No	Yes	No	No	—
Western New England College	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Westfield State College	Yes	Yes	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	No
Wheaton College (Illinois)	Yes	Yes	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	No
Wheaton College (Massachusetts)	Yes	Yes	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	No
Whittier College	Yes	Yes	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	No
Wichita State University	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	—
Widener University	Yes	Yes	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	No
Wilkes College	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
William and Mary, College of	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	—
William Paterson College	Yes	No	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	No
William Penn College	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Williams College	Yes	No	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	No
Winona State University	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Winston-Salem State University	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Winthrop College	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	Yes	No	Yes	—
Wisconsin State University Conference	Yes	No	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	No
Wisconsin Women's Intercollegiate Athletic Conference	Yes	Yes	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	No
Wisconsin, University of, Eau Claire	Yes	Yes	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	No
Wisconsin, University of, Green Bay	Yes	No	No	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	No	—
Wisconsin, University of, La Crosse	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	No
Wisconsin, University of, Madison	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	—
Wisconsin, University of, Milwaukee	Yes	No	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	No
Wisconsin, University of, Oshkosh	Yes	No	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	No
Wisconsin, University of, Parkside	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Wisconsin, University of, Platteville	Yes	Yes	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	No
Wisconsin, University of, River Falls	Yes	No	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	No
Wisconsin, University of, Stevens Point	Yes	No	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	No
Wisconsin, University of, Stout	Yes	Yes	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	No
Wisconsin, University of, Superior	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Wisconsin, University of, Whitewater	Yes	No	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	No
Wittenberg University	Yes	No	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	No
Wofford College	Ilp2	No	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Women's Intercollegiate Athletic Conference	Yes	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	No
Wooster, College of	Yes	Yes	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	No
Worcester Polytechnic Institute	Yes	Yes	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	Yes
Worcester State College	Yes	No	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	No
Wright State University	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	—
Wyoming, University of	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No	—
Xavier University (Ohio)	Yes	No	No	No	No	No	Yes	No	No	—
Yale University	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	—
Yeshiva University	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
York College (Pennsylvania)	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Youngstown State University	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	—
Totals	Y	653	291	120	151	175	183	273	135	103
	N	42	404	189	159	137	154	40	179	208
	A	3	11	2	4	3	2	1	2	4
	Ilp1	6	2	—	—	—	2	—	—	—
	Ilp2	4	1	1	1	—	—	—	—	3

Legend: Y - Yes, N - No, A - Abstentions; Ilp1 - Illegal (wrong proposal number); Ilp2 - Illegal (no vote punched).

Appendix C

83rd Annual Convention

Nominating Committee

Chair-Kathleen M. McNally

- I-1-Kathleen M. McNally, La Salle University
 I-1-Kevin M. White, University of Maine, Orono
 I-2-Richard L. Sander, Virginia Commonwealth University
 I-2-B. J. Skelton, Clemson University
 I-3-Daniel G. Gibbens, University of Oklahoma
 I-3-Bradford E. Kinsman, University of Detroit
 I-4-Michael T. Johnson, University of Houston
 I-4-Margie H. McDonald, High Country Athletic Conference
 II-1-Francis W. Poisson, University of Bridgeport
 II-2-Wilburn A. Campbell Jr., Albany State College (Ga.)
 II-3-George M. MacDonald, Grand Valley State University
 II-4-Karen L. Miller, California State Poly. U., Pomona
 III-1-Lawrence R. Schiner, Jersey City State College
 III-2-Maureen T. Horan-Pease, Drew University
 III-3-Louis F. Miller, Hampden-Sydney College
 III-4-John M. Schael, Washington University (Missouri)

Men's Committee on Committees

Chair-Charles Whitcomb

- District 1-Lawrence P. Boyd, Framingham State College
 District 2-Gene A. Carpenter, Millersville Univ. of Pennsylvania
 District 3-Dave Hart, Southern Conference
 District 4-Bruce A. Corrie, Northwestern University
 District 5-Ken B. Jones, Missouri Intercollegiate Athletic Assn.
 District 6-Don Landry, Southland Conference
 District 7-Ronald D. Stephenson, Big Sky Conference
 District 8-Charles Whitcomb, San Jose State University
 At Large-McKinley Boston Jr., Kean College
 At Large-Gene E. Hooks, Wake Forest University
 At Large-William D. McHenry, Washington and Lee University
 At Large-John M. Williams, Mississippi College

Women's Committee on Committees

Chair-Judith R. Holland

- District 1-Judith A. Sullivan, Southeastern Massachusetts Univ.
 District 2-Susan W. Lubking, West Chester Univ. of Pennsylvania
 District 3-Joyce Sorrell, Troy State University
 District 4-Marnie W. Swift, University of Toledo
 District 5-Barbara Hibner, University of Nebraska, Lincoln
 District 6-Martha E. Hawthorne, Rice University
 District 7-Fern Gardner, University of Utah
 District 8-Judith R. Holland, University of California, Los Angeles
 At Large-Mary Frances Heishman, Bridgewater College (Va.)
 At Large-Peggy Martin, Central Missouri State University

At Large—Elizabeth Murphey, University of Georgia
At Large—Lynn M. Pacala, Occidental College

Voting Committee

Chair—Leanne Grotke

District 1—Richard J. Hazelton, Trinity College (Connecticut)
District 2—Joseph Barresi, College of Staten Island
District 3—Eric Hyman, Virginia Military Institute
District 4—Marnie W. Swift, University of Toledo
District 5—Erv Mondt, Morningside College
District 6—G. Ann Uhler, Texas Woman's University
District 7—Kathy Noble, University of Montana
District 8—Bradley L. Rothermel, Univ. of Nevada, Las Vegas
At Large—Prentice Gautt, Big Eight Conference
At Large—Leanne Grotke, California State University, Fullerton
At Large—John C. Martin, Delaware State College
At Large—John Semanik, Drexel University
At Large—Patricia W. Wall, Southeastern Conference

Memorial Resolutions Committee

Chair—Bradford W. Hovious

Joanne A. Fortunato, Keene State College
Bradford W. Hovious, University of Texas, El Paso
Reginald L. Price, California State University, San Bernardino

Credentials Committee

Chair—Charles J. Prophet

Fran Curci, University of Tampa
Diane Fairchild, Grinnell College
Charles J. Prophet, Mississippi Valley State University

Parliamentarian

Alan J. Chapman, Rice University

1990 Convention

Loews Anatole Hotel, Dallas, Texas, January 7-11

Appendix D

Past Convention Sites

Convention	Year	City, Hotel
1st	1906	New York City (Murray Hill)
2nd	1907	New York City (Murray Hill)
3rd	1908	New York City (Murray Hill)
4th	1909	New York City (Murray Hill)
5th	1910	New York City (Astor)
6th	1911	New York City (Astor)
7th	1912	New York City (Astor)
8th	1913	New York City (Astor)
9th	1914	Chicago (LaSalle)
10th	1915	New York City (Astor)
11th	1916	New York City (Astor)
12th	1917	New York City (Astor)
13th	1918	New York City (Astor)
14th	1919	New York City (Astor)
15th	1920	Chicago (Sherman)
16th	1921	New York City (Astor)
17th	1922	New York City (Astor)
18th	1923	Atlanta (Georgian Terrace)
19th	1924	New York City (Astor)
20th	1925	New York City (Astor)
21st	1926	New York City (Astor)
22nd	1927	New York City (Astor)
23rd	1928	New Orleans (Roosevelt)
24th	1929*	New York City (Astor)
25th	1930	New York City (Astor)
26th	1931	New York City (Astor)
27th	1932	New York City (Astor)
28th	1933	Chicago (Stevens)
29th	1934	New York City (Pennsylvania)
30th	1935	New York City (Pennsylvania)
31st	1936	New York City (Pennsylvania)
32nd	1937	New Orleans (St. Charles)
33rd	1938	Chicago (Sherman)
34th	1939	Los Angeles (Biltmore)
35th	1940	New York City (New Yorker)
36th	1941	Detroit (Book-Cadillac)
37th	1942	New York City (Astor)
	1943	No meeting
38th	1944†	New York City (Biltmore)
39th	1945	Columbus, Ohio (Deshler-Wallick)
40th	1946	St. Louis (Jefferson)
41st	1947	New York City (New Yorker)
42nd	1948	New York City (New Yorker)
43rd	1949	San Francisco (St. Francis)

*Convened January 1, 1930.

†Officers, Executive Committee and chairs of rules committees only.

Past Convention Sites _____ A-147

44th	1950	New York City (Commodore)
45th	1951	Dallas (Adolphus)
46th	1952	Cincinnati (Netherland Plaza)
47th	1953	Washington (Mayflower)
48th	1954	Cincinnati (Netherland Plaza)
49th	1955	New York City (New Yorker)
50th	1956	Los Angeles (Statler Hilton)
51st	1957	St. Louis (Jefferson)
52nd	1958	Philadelphia (Bellvue Stratford)
53rd	1959	Cincinnati (Netherland Hilton)
54th	1960	New York City (Astor)
55th	1961	Pittsburgh (Penn Sheraton)
56th	1962	Chicago (Conrad Hilton)
57th	1963	Los Angeles (Statler Hilton)
58th	1964	New York City (Commodore)
59th	1965	Chicago (Conrad Hilton)
60th	1966	Washington (Sheraton Park)
61st	1967	Houston (Sheraton Lincoln)
62nd	1968	New York City (Biltmore)
63rd	1969	Los Angeles (Hilton)
64th	1970	Washington (Statler Hilton)
65th	1971	Houston (Astroworld)
66th	1972	Hollywood, Florida (Diplomat)
67th	1973	Chicago (Palmer House)
1st Special	1973	Chicago (Regency Hyatt House)
68th	1974	San Francisco (St. Francis)
69th	1975	Washington (Sheraton-Park)
2nd Special	1975	Chicago (Palmer House)
3rd Special	1976	St. Louis (Stouffer's Riverfront Inn)
70th	1976	St. Louis (Stouffer's Riverfront Inn)
71st	1977	Miami Beach (Fontainebleau)
72nd	1978	Atlanta (Peachtree Plaza)
73rd	1979	San Francisco (St. Francis)
74th	1980	New Orleans (Fairmont)
75th	1981	Miami Beach (Fontainebleau Hilton)
4th Special	1981	St. Louis (Stouffer's Riverfront)
76th	1982	Houston (Hyatt Regency)
77th	1983	San Diego (Town and Country)
78th	1984	Dallas (Loews Anatole)
79th	1985	Nashville (Opryland)
5th Special	1985	New Orleans (Hyatt Regency)
80th	1986	New Orleans (Hilton Riverside)
81st	1987	San Diego (Town and Country)
6th Special	1987	Dallas (Loews Anatole)
82nd	1988	Nashville (Opryland)
83rd	1989	San Francisco (Hilton)

Appendix E

NCAA Officers, 1906-1988

Years Name, Institution

President

1906-1913—Capt. Palmer E. Pierce, U.S. Military Academy
 1914-1916—LeBaron R. Briggs, Harvard University
 1917-1929—Brig. Gen. Palmer E. Pierce, U.S. Military Academy
 1930-1932—Charles W. Kennedy, Princeton University
 1933-1937—Maj. John L. Griffith, Intercollegiate Conference (Big Ten)
 1938-1940—William B. Owens, Stanford University
 1941-1944—Phillip O. Badger, New York University
 1945-1946—Wilbur C. Smith, Tulane University, University of Wyoming
 1947-1949—Karl E. Lieb, University of Iowa
 1950-1952—Hugh C. Willett, University of Southern California
 1953-1954—Albert B. Moore, University of Alabama, Tuscaloosa
 1955-1956—Clarence P. Houston, Tufts College
 1957-1958—Frank N. Gardner, Drake University
 1959-1960—Herbert J. Dorricott, Western State College (Colorado)
 1961-1962—Henry B. Hardt, Texas Christian University
 1963-1964—Robert F. Ray, University of Iowa
 1965-1966—Everett D. Barnes, Colgate University
 1967-1968—Marcus L. Plant, University of Michigan
 1969-1970—Harry M. Cross, University of Washington
 1971-1972—Earl M. Ramer, University of Tennessee, Knoxville
 1973-1974—Alan J. Chapman, Rice University
 1975-1976—John A. Fuzak, Michigan State University
 1977-1978—J. Neils Thompson, University of Texas, Austin
 1979-1980—William J. Flynn, Boston College
 1981-1982—James Frank, Lincoln University (Missouri)
 1983-1984—John L. Toner, University of Connecticut
 1985-1986—John R. Davis, Oregon State University
 1987-1988—Wilford S. Bailey, Auburn University
 1989-1990—Albert M. Witte, University of Arkansas, Fayetteville

Secretary-Treasurer

1906-1908—Louis A. Bevier Jr., Rutgers University, New Brunswick
 1908—William A. Lambeth, University of Virginia (Treasurer only)
 1909-1939—Frank W. Nicolson, Wesleyan University
 1940-1944—Maj. John L. Griffith, Intercollegiate Conference (Big Ten)
 1945-1951—Kenneth L. Wilson, Intercollegiate Conference (Big Ten)
 1952-1954—Earl S. Fullbrook, University of Nebraska, Lincoln
 1955-1956—Ralph W. Aigler, University of Michigan
 1957-1958—Edwin D. Mouzon Jr., Southern Methodist University
 1959-1960—Gen. Percy L. Sadler, Lehigh University
 1961-1962—Rev. Wilfred H. Crowley, Santa Clara University

1963-1964—Everett D. Barnes, Colgate University
 1965-1966—Francis E. Smiley, Colorado School of Mines
 1967-1968—Ernest B. McCoy, Pennsylvania State University
 1969-1970—William J. Flynn, Boston College
 1971-1972—Samuel E. Barnes, Howard University, University of
 District of Columbia
 1973-1974—Richard P. Koenig, Valparaiso University
 1975-1976—Stanley J. Marshall, South Dakota State University
 1977-1978—Edgar A. Sherman, Muskingum College
 1979-1980—James Frank, Lincoln University (Missouri)
 1981-1982—John L. Toner, University of Connecticut
 1983-1984—John R. Davis, Oregon State University
 1985-1986—Wilford S. Bailey, Auburn University
 1987-1988—Thomas J. Frericks, University of Dayton

Division I Vice-President

1983-1984—Gwendolyn Norrell, Michigan State University
 1985 —Arless L. Roaden, Tennessee Technological University
 1986 —Lewis A. Cryer, Pacific Coast Athletic Association
 1987-1988—Albert M. Witte, University of Arkansas, Fayetteville
 1989-1990—B. J. Skelton, Clemson University

Division II Vice-President

1983 —Edwin W. Lawrence, University of Alaska, Fairbanks
 1984-1985—Ade L. Sponberg, North Dakota State University
 1986 —Asa N. Green, Livingston University
 1987-1988—Howard Elwell, Gannon University
 1989-1990—Jerry M. Hughes, Central Missouri State University

Division III Vice-President

1983 —Kenneth J. Weller, Central College (Iowa)
 1984-1985—Elizabeth A. Kruczek, Fitchburg State College
 1986-1987—Judith M. Sweet, University of California, San Diego
 1988-1989—Alvin J. Van Wie, College of Wooster

NCAA

NATL COLLEGIATE ATHLETIC ASSOC



1NCAA00002152N